DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 153 957 HE 009 850

AUTHOR Campbell, Duncan D.
TITLE Those Tumultuous Years. The Goals of the President of the University of Alberta during the Decade of the 1960s.
INSTITUTION Alberta Univ., Edmonton.
PUB DATE 77
NOTE 72p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Attitudes; Adult Education; Curriculum; Developing Nations; *Foreign Countries; Governance; Government School Relationship; Graduate Study; Higher Education; *Presidents; Research; School Community Relationship; *Speeches; *University Administration
IDENTIFIERS *Johns (Walter H); *University of Alberta (Canada)

ABSTRACT

The goals held by Walter H. Johns, president of the University of Alberta during the 1960s, are inferred from his speeches of that period. A survey of the university's environment of that period and a sketch of the presidential role are provided. Following a synopsis of President Johns' general observations on the nature of the university, attention is drawn to his views of curricula, teaching, research, graduate study and the university's continuing education function. His perceptions of the role of the student body are followed by a review of his concept of university government, including the nature of the presidential office and the special character of university administration. His analysis of the character of the university's external relationships are also examined, including those with government and quasi-government agencies, other institutions of higher education, the community at large, and with underdeveloped countries. (Author/SPG)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED155957

Those Tumultuous Years

The Goals of the President of the University of Alberta during the Decade of the 1960s

Duncan D. Campbell

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Univ of Alberta

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

The University of Alberta

Those Tumultuous Years

The Goals of the President of the University of Alberta during the Decade of the 1960s

Duncan D. Campbell

The University of Alberta 1977

This book has been funded by the Library,
the Alma Mater Fund, and the Alumni Association

Copyright © 1977, The Library, The University of Alberta

All rights reserved
No part of this publication may be produced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form, or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior consent of the copyright owner.

Table of Contents

Those Tumultuous Years

Past as Prologue 1

The University's Environment in the 1960s 5

The Balancing Act: The President as Leader 11

The President as Interpreter 21

The Nature of the University:
The Tasks of Higher Education 22

Curriculum and Teaching 24

Research 29

Graduate Studies 33

Public Service 36

The Student Body 37

The Organization and Administration of the University 38

The University in its External Relationships 46

The Goals of The President for the University 57

References Cited 63

Foreword

When Walter H. Johns became its President in 1959, the University of Alberta was a directly recognizable, if somewhat larger, reflection of the institution founded some fifty years before. That earlier university had a mission: to serve as a "sanctuary of truth" on a prairie frontier. That the principal role of its faculty was to teach and that the University stood *in loco parentis* to its students were unquestioned operational precepts.

The next ten years, during which time both as member of the Senate of the University of Alberta and as Deputy Minister of Education I was closely connected with University affairs, was a period of unprecedented growth and change for that institution. By 1969, the University had been transformed. In that decade, it had become an institution devoted to professional method, in which professional rather than institutional values predominated.

As does every institutional leader, the president of a university has not only to set direction for his university but also to diagnose change as it occurs. He must be an astute observer of social trends, quick to relate his institution to emerging social needs and tireless in the interpretation of the direction of university growth to faculty, to government and to citizens throughout the province.

In this interesting and perceptive account, Dr. Campbell distills from the President's speeches the goals of the chief executive officer of the University during that turbulent decade.

June, 1976

Dr. T.C. Byrne
President
Athabasca University

Preface

More obviously than at any other time in this century, universities are in a state of flux. Society's needs have shifted; new demands are made of the institution. From the previous decade of rapid expansion, accompanied by general public approval, the university has stabilized or receded and more than that, become the target of critical questioning. Keen concern about university goals, expressed in Commission studies undertaken in all Canadian provinces in this decade, is thus not surprising.

Because the university is, in its essence, conservative, abrupt or radical changes seem unlikely. What is probable is that the future goals of universities will build, coral-like, on what has been.

Which gives point, then, to a review of the immediate past of one institution, the University of Alberta, with the aim of determining its intentions during the 1960s, a decade of tumultuous change. In what follows, it is proposed to infer from his speeches of that period, the goals held by the President of the University for his institution. These speeches, it is recognized, offer only one of several kinds of evidence of the direction which the university set for itself. Others are to be found in the decisions taken by the Board of Governors and the General Faculty Council, operating data reflecting the rate and character of growth of the institution, and the statutory requirements of *The University Act*. Nonetheless, these presidential speeches are of considerable significance both as expressions of institutional direction and as they reflect the nature of the office itself.

Grateful acknowledgment is made to Professor Emeritus of Classics, Walter H. Johns, President during that decade, for access to his papers and for his recollections of the University's development, to the University of Alberta Alumni Association, the Alma Mater Fund, and the University Library for their support and to Mrs. Anne Le Rougetel for her expert, patient preparation of the manuscript.

Duncan D. Campbell

Past as Prologue

The decade of the 1960s was a period of extraordinary growth and change for the University of Alberta and the most hectic of its existence.

The student population of the University increased over those years by two and one-half times. The graduate student body alone expanded by over 400 per cent. In physical size, in terms of the space available to it, the University more than tripled. The complement of full-time teachers, with graduate teaching assistants, nearly quadrupled. Throughout most of those ten years, these problems, in particular, were continuously pressing; how to provide space for a mushrooming student body; where to recruit the staff who were to instruct them; and what priority to give to the development of libraries, laboratories, residences, and equipment.

That decade, too, was one of organizational change and administrative remoulding. The student body had emerged from that tractable, somewhat apathetic disposition characteristic of the past, vociferous in its demand to participate in decisions concerning education. Reformist zeal now infused its activities which sometimes erupted into confrontation with university administrators and, on occasion, into physical belligerence. The smouldering fires of faculty activism were fanned by the Duff-Berdahl Report of 1966 (Commission sponsored by the Canadian Association of University Teachers and the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada, 1966) which articulated staff demands for a more significant voice in all of the affairs of the University. New bureaucracies flowered on the campus. Committees created to synthesize opinion of both students and staff multiplied enormously. The organizational-administrative character of the institution was, in short, substantially reworked and launched in the direction of a faculty-dominated community which

latterly, in North America, has been characterized as an organized anarchy with uncertain goals.

Meanwhile, a parallel burst of development was taking place at the University of Alberta's southern branch in Calgary accompanied, predictably, by clamour for its independence. Insistent demand for its autonomy was recognized by the promulgation in 1966 of the new *Universities Act*, an instrument which also delineated in statutory terms important organizational changes and shifts in the balance of power within the university institution.

The role of the president itself changed. The responsibilities of office, according to its incumbent, were translated from those of chief executive officer to harmonizer, mediator, and catalyst.

> *Instead of simply being chief executive officer, the President found himself consulting endless committees, elected committees very often, before any action could be taken and the consultation and what I might call introspection became a very important part, or at least a very major part, of the University's activities and the President, as chief executive officer, found his role somewhat diminished. (Johns, 1972)*

Across Alberta there was being created by government a substantial network of community colleges, a type of institution new to the province, their very existence necessitating some form of linkage with the province's universities. During the decade, a new university, the University of Lethbridge, was created; another, Athabasca University, was conceived.

Pervasive ferment and explosive growth, punctuated by frequent crises, characterized the decade. But, in all the clamour and excitement, the University produced an expanded stream of professionals and made available for public service a larger body of consultants and researchers. Equally significant, and despite the turbulence, this decade of rapid expansion was accompanied by general public approval.

Substantial change clearly lies ahead for the University of Alberta. Intimations of it are evident in the Report of the Royal Commission, *A Choice of Futures* (Commission on Educational Planning, 1972),[1] in the establishment of a provincial Department of Advanced Education, in the policy documents it has produced and in the movement to reconstruct *The Universities Act*. These changes, in turn, are reflective of a shifting groundswell of public opinion which reflects not the warm acceptance of the 1960s but

rather a querulous anxiety. Because it has acquired a large staff and has become an institution of considerable substance, the University, in fact, has been translated into a political creature, a circumstance which obliges its retreat from the anonymity which characterized it in the first half of the century. Having thus gravitated into the public consciousness, it is inevitably faced with the obligation to reconcile its sense of direction to the demands of society, a fact acknowledged by the University's current President. *But we must never lose sight of the fact that our life-support system is controlled by a society which can, at its will, turn off our valves. . . . These are the hard realities of the situation, and as academics we had better learn to cope.* (Gunning, 1974)

Undoubtedly, the goals of the University of Alberta will continue to be modified and its directions shifted. Marshall McLuhan sardonically notes the predilection of our society to establish new directions shaped by a rear-view mirror image of the past. But what is past is prologue. In the university institution, the new goals established will almost certainly recognize, and be linked to, those of the past.

One is more likely to get a clearer view of what the outcome of the university as an institution *ought to be* if one can first get clear what its goals are and have been. Which is the purpose of this study: to examine the goals held for the University of Alberta by its President, Walter H. Johns, during the decade of the 1960s and interpreted to the University's various publics through his many addresses. A survey of the University's environment of that period and a sketch of the presidential role will provide a backdrop to this examination.

---

[1]Similar in tone are: Commission on Post-Secondary Education, Report of the Commission, *The Learning Society* (Toronto: Ministry of Government Services, 1972); Task Force on Post-Secondary Education in Manitoba, Report of the Task Force, *Post-Secondary Education in Manitoba* (Winnipeg: Queen's Printer, 1973); Royal Commission on University Organization and Structure in Saskatchewan, *Report* (Regina: Queen's Printer, 1973).

The University's Environment in the 1960s

The province served by the University of Alberta during that decade was ethnically diverse. About one-half of its population originated in the British Isles. Of the balance, fourteen per cent were German, and somewhat lesser proportions were drawn from the Scandinavian countries and the Ukraine. Together, these four groups comprised nearly three-quarters of the population at the beginning of the decade. (Alberta Bureau of Statistics, 1970:144) An east-west line drawn somewhat south of Edmonton, the capital city, would evenly divide the province's numbers. The two major cities, Edmonton and Calgary, 200 miles to the south, comprise about half of the total while a third major population area is centred on Lethbridge in the south-west corner. Steadily but surely, a significant shift has taken place in the distribution of its citizens between the urban and rural setting. Where in 1921 nearly seventy per cent of Albertans lived in rural areas, by 1966 these proportions were almost exactly reversed. The great bulk of Albertans today live in the province's towns and cities and their proportion continues to grow.

The basic character of the provincial economy was reflected in the distribution of its labour force by industry. The number employed in agriculture during the 1960s declined from the previous decade while the proportions employed in manufacturing, construction, transportation, trades, government, and non-government service grew. The single most eventful fact in the economic life of the province was the discovery of major oil reserves in 1947. Not alone but most significant, oil has been the factor responsible for the general affluence of the province which since 1950 has been grouped with Ontario and British Columbia as the "have" provinces of Canada. That prosperity is readily apparent in comparisons of personal income data. In reflection both of this

sudden wealth and of the esteem in which higher education was held at the time, financial support to the University during the decade was generous.

For thirty-six years, from 1935 to 1971, the government of the province was dominated by the Social Credit Party. Indeed, during all of that period it not only formed the government but, in the numbers of its adherents elected to office, almost completely captured the Legislature. Paradoxically, though it had its origins in an obscure branch of economic unorthodoxy, it is generally conceded to have given sound, stable, conservative leadership to the economic and social development of the province. There can be little doubt that this political stability engendered an atmosphere of mutual confidence between University and government which profoundly and positively influenced the orderly, rational development of the province's senior education institution.

The recollections of the former President concerning the degree of influence of the provincial government on the University are of particular interest.

I think that I should say that it [the provincial government] hardly had any influence on the direction of the University at all, nor did it attempt any. They did keep a constant and very interested watching brief on the University's development and I had the impression that they generally approved these directions. If they had not approved them, I am sure that they would have quickly said so. But, except in one or two instances, the Government was prepared to leave the matter of leadership to the University faculty, Board of Governors, Senate, Alumni, and other bodies because they felt they were doing the job satisfactorily. (Johns, 1972)

There was, on occasion, consultation with government with respect to priorities, but these priorities were determined on University initiative rather than on that of government.

I am sure that in discussions with the Deputy Minister of Education, who at that time served on the Board of Governors, . . . we did arrive at priorities to a certain degree, but this would often result from initiative that came from the University rather than from Government . . . the Government took very little initiative in promoting the new developments at the University or directing the lines of existing developments. They were happy to leave it to the University because, on examination of the way the University was going, they seemed to feel that the developments and the plans being followed at the University were satisfactory to them as a

Government responsible for meeting the needs of this Province. (Ibid.)

Prior to 1966, both the Deputy Minister of Education and the Deputy Provincial Treasurer served as members of the University's Board of Governors. But in their capacity as members of the Board, they did not function, the President asserts, in any sense as a "pipeline" from government to the University.

I cannot recall . . . a single case in which the Deputy Minister of Education served as transmittor of suggestions from the Government. His role on the Board of Governors was, I think, much more a personal role . . . as a person capable of resolving complex problems, his contributions were simply enormous. Returning to the Deputy Provincial Treasurer, I will say that his contributions were excellent in matters of what you might call the business side of the University . . . and he did serve perhaps as one of the better agencies for dampening down slightly the over-exuberant aspirations of certain elements in the University. He was always prompt to remind us of the costs of new projects and perhaps this forced us to examine such projects with particular care. If the projects were justified and he felt that they were justified, he certainly removed any opposition he might have had. (Ibid.)

The University of Alberta was a publicly supported, co-educational institution, sharing with the Universities of Calgary and Lethbridge the sole right of conferring degrees (other than degrees in divinity) within the province. Its internal organization was for the most part, along conventional lines—a *mélange* of departments, schools, faculties, institutes and service groups.

The main campus comprised 154 acres along the bank of the North Saskatchewan River in a suburb of the city. A University farm of some 700 acres was the largest property separate from the main campus, though not the only land holding of the institution. Some twenty major teaching and research buildings were situated on this campus with two affiliated colleges, five halls of residence, a Students' Union, and service buildings including parking structures. (University of Alberta, 1971)

Alberta became a province in 1905. Almost immediately, its Legislature passed an Act authorizing the establishment of the University of Alberta. Selected as its first President was Henry Marshall Tory, an eminent Canadian educator who held the office from 1908 to 1928 and subsequently lent his considerable vigour to spearhead the development of the National Research Council, the

University of British Columbia and Carleton College in Ottawa. Classes opened in September, 1908; by 1914 registration had reached 439. While the growth prior to and immediately following the First World War was rapid, it slowed to a trickle through the depression years. The first Summer Session of the University was held in 1919; the development of a Research Council of Alberta in 1919 reinforced the University's emphasis on science. The outbreak of war in 1939 brought considerable disruption to the University's life as many of its facilities were used extensively by all three branches of the armed services. The most significant academic development of that period was the University's acceptance, in 1945, of sole responsibility for the training of Alberta teachers. Established in 1928, the School of Education became a Faculty in 1942 and, following the war, grew to be the largest in the University in terms of enrolment.

A major change in the legislative Act governing the University, thought by some to have been made in a fit of political pique, occurred in the mid-1940s at which time those powers of its Senate having to do with academic matters were transferred to a new body, the General Faculty Council, with ultimate authority vested in a Board of Governors. Subsequently, no major changes occurred in the University's constitution until the promulgation of *The Universities Act* of 1966 which provided for the establishment of other and separate *provincial* universities all under the scrutiny of a Universities Commission, a newly-created intermediary body between government and universities.

After the war, as in other universities in postwar Canada, a flood of veterans assisted by the federal government poured into the University. Registration rose to a peak of nearly 5,000 in 1947-48. But, while student numbers grew in reflection of this national policy, the numbers of full-time staff increased at a considerably less rapid pace, as did the physical development of the campus. The difficult, though exciting, postwar years merged into the slower growth of the 1950s. Meanwhile, the University's efforts on the Calgary campus, which had been established in 1951, expanded. Other post-secondary institutions, new to Alberta, community colleges, were created at Medicine Hat, Lethbridge, Red Deer, and Grande Prairie.

In the ten-year period of the sixties, however, university enrolment rocketed from approximately 6,400 to 17,300. In its entire history, no period reflected greater excitement and

organizational turbulence. The University's physical plant, its enrolment, staff, and facilities expanded dramatically, its organizational structure was remodelled and its vision enlarged. Out of this somewhat parochial institution of the 1930s was to emerge an institution of stature.

The Balancing Act: The President as Leader

The university presidency has become an illusion. Often, to members of the public, to members of the staff and perhaps, indeed, to the incumbent himself as he takes office, the president is chief executive officer of the institution — and all-powerful. But, as observation and recent research confirm (Cohen and March, 1974), far from these heroic expectations, the president has only modest control over the events of university life.

The conventional path to the presidency is a well-posted route. The aspirant invariably comes to the position out of the academic community, through a series of filters, as it were, climbing through the professorial ranks, perhaps a department headship, the dean's office or a vice-presidency. He assumes what likely is to be the highest office of his career after lengthy experience, often in his own institution, of a kind that distinctly conditions his future behaviour as university leader. His is a standard academic experience, marked by standard academic credentials and the standard academic's view of academe. He comes to the task after as many as thirty to forty years of immersion in the values of the academy—first as a student, then as a faculty member and, finally, as academic administrator. Inevitably, this process of socialization produces presidents who have not only a deep commitment to the university institution and its values, but whose vision of the development feasible to it falls within conservative bounds. Indeed, the essential conservatism of the presidency could only be modified by sacrificing this well-established mode of recruitment.

If there is a fundamental characteristic of the office, it is its ambiguity. The president is politician, diplomat, and statesman. He is required to be a sound manager with a keen eye to a balanced budget; simultaneously, he must function as a moral leader of the community, fearlessly attacking evil and scourging inequity. The

university presidency by its nature is reactive and responsive. The incumbent cannot ignore the deeply held beliefs of members of the Board of Governors with whom he sits, or the opinions of his administrative colleagues, of the staff of whom he is not master but rather *primus inter pares,* or the preferences of community leaders, of students, of government and quasi-government agencies, among a host of other groups. His is the task of attempting to reconcile, if indeed that is possible, the invariably conflicting pressures on the institution. It is idle to assert, as university presidents sometimes do in more mellow moments, that they are without power. The office and its potential to influence, easy access to centres of authority in the community, a ready audience in the community for words of interpretation, and access to discretionary funds, together form a potent arsenal. Presidential power derives from his capacity to use these elements to persuade. This is a task which demands patience, energy, and courage. But above all it requires a sharply clear sense of the goals intended and the will and the capacity to articulate them to his institution's several publics.

Clark Kerr, who describes himself as coming to and leaving the presidency of the University of California, in each case "fired with enthusiasm," paints a sardonic though instructive picture of the office:

The university president . . . is expected to be a friend of the students, a colleague of the faculty, a good fellow with the alumni, a sound administrator with the trustees, a good speaker with the public, an astute bargainer with the foundations and the federal agencies, a politician with the state legislature, a friend of industry, labor, and agriculture, a persuasive diplomat with donors, a champion of education generally, a supporter of the professions (particularly law and medicine), a spokesman to the press, a scholar in his own right, a public servant at the state and national levels, a devotee of opera and football equally, a decent human being, a good husband and father, an active member of a church. Above all he must enjoy traveling in airplanes, eating his meals in public, and attending public ceremonies. No one can be all of these things. Some succeed at being none.

He should be firm, yet gentle; sensitive to others, insensitive to himself; look to the past and the future, yet be firmly planted in the present; both visionary and sound; affable, yet reflective; know the value of a dollar and realize that ideas cannot be bought; inspiring in his visions yet cautious in what he does; a man of

principle yet able to make a deal; a man with broad perspective who will follow the details conscientiously; a good American but ready to criticize the status quo fearlessly; a seeker of truth where the truth may not hurt too much; a source of public policy pronouncements when they do not reflect on his own institution. He should sound like a mouse at home and look like a lion abroad. He is one of the marginal men in a democratic society—of whom there are many others—on the margin of many groups, many ideas, many endeavors, many characteristics. He is a marginal man but at the very center of the total process. (Kerr, 1963:29-30)

For the survival both of his institution and of himself, the president must balance the values of the past and the prospects of the future with the realities of the present. His role thus oscillates, depending on the circumstances, between mediator and authority, but, in the main, tending toward the former.

The accomplishment of his multiple tasks requires personal qualities and skill of the highest order in administrative politics. He must persist in the face of nagging opposition, facilitate, not dampen, participation in his and others' schemes. He must manage as best he can — though always unobtrusively.

But his quintessential responsibility is that of interpreting his university to all of its constituents, on and off the campus, of acting as a channel among all of its publics—carrying proposals, suggestions, warning or encouragement. Of all the requirements by the institution of its president, none is more important than that of articulating its aims, of defining its goals to a variety of publics in a host of differing circumstances. It is the president's task and, virtually, his alone, to sketch a vision of the university; for without vision there is aimlessness. His is the unique responsibility for discussing, clarifying, defining, and explaining the charted course of his institution, both to his colleages and to the community. Just as there are external to the campus a variety of publics, so also are there within the institution its several constituencies—the student body, the board, the several faculties, his fellow administrators — with all of whom he must coexist if, as is likely, he cannot stand in perfect agreement.

Thus, the clarification of institutional goals is the central element of the president's mission. Without clear goals, his institution is vulnerable. *Leadership is irresponsible when it fails to set goals and therefore lets the institution drift. The absence of controlling aims forces decisions to be made in response to*

immediate pressures. Of course, many large enterprises do drift, yet they survive. The penalties are not always swift, and very often bare survival is possible even though the fullest potentialities of the enterprise are not realized. (Selznick, 1969:186)

Equally, too great generality of purpose, or conflict within its elements, breeds that condition in which the organization is prey to the special interests of its publics. *Indeed, the very generality of . . . purpose is congenial to the opportunism of these groups. But when institutional continuity and identity are at stake, a definition of mission is required that will take account of the organization's distinctive character including present and prospective capabilities, as well as the requirements of playing a desired role in a particular . . . context. (Selznick, 1969:188)*

The organizational theorist views each institution as faced with a set of imperatives with which it must cope if it is to succeed or, indeed, survive. It is these imperatives on which the president's energy must be focussed:

The security of the organization as a whole relative to the social forces in its environment. That is, there must be a continuous awareness of potential encroachment from the environment, the forestalling of threatened aggression, and the avoidance of negative consequences from the actions of others.

The stability of the lines of authority and communication. The linkages through which leadership is able to connect itself to staff and they to it, must, like a telephone line, be kept in good repair.

The stability of informal relations within the organization. "Informal organization" within the institution describes the mechanisms and manner through which individuals and subgroups mesh with one another. The significant requirement is that of cementing those relationships which broaden communication and which sustain formal authority in day-to-day operations.

The continuity of policy and the sources of its determination. The organization will seek stability through statutory or other authority or popular mandate in order to achieve the permanency and legitimacy of its acts. Of special importance, there must be confidence within the organization that such stability will not be jeopardized by unpredictable or capricious changes in policy.

A homogeneity of outlook with respect to the meaning and the role of the organization. Unity within the organization derives from a common understanding of what the organization is and what it is meant to do. Should that common understanding break down through internal conflict, the continued existence of the organization is endangered.

Major forces, both internal and external, bear on a university's choice of goals. The president's operational arena is this complex of pressures from the institution's varied constituents.

The organization's external environment is ambiguous. Problems transmitted to the president and his administrative colleagues are not clearly defined; those that appear clearly formulated may, in fact, be misleading. The environment faced by the university is predictably complicated and multifaceted, so much so that, out of necessity, relatively simple images of the community about it must suffice in the administration of the institution. As an additional complication, the chief executive officer must, to be realistic, assume that each part of his organization is likely to view an identical environment in a different way. That part of the external environment which reinforces the perceptions of one group within the institution may threaten those of another. (Dill, 1964:206-208)

The demands of the institution's publics, too, are diverse and perhaps conflicting. Business will expect the university to supply competent recruits. Government will expect to draw on the institution's expertise in research. The community at large will ask ease of access to the institution and, in the same breath, demand high standards. Citizens will expect universities to offer extension courses of wide variety and to maintain an intellectual and cultural leadership. And so, as Werdell pessimistically observes,

administration of a multiversity is, almost by necessity, a holding action. In the face of conflicting demands and purposes, balance among the competing forces is reluctantly substituted for the more difficult task of molding an institution that best fosters diversity among its students. (Werdell, 1968:20-21)

The president's task of interpreting his institution to the community is complicated by a notion fundamental to the very idea of a university — its role as critic. Not all academics by any means accept the idea of partnership between the university and the society that nurtures it. Indeed, some will argue, separateness from society

and freedom for the university to set its own goals, independent of society, is essential to its optimum development. In this view, the university is conceived not as an education production line in the service of society; rather, the critical appraisal of society, the diagnosis of its ills, is the essential function of the university, the *sine qua non*. Consequently, the university must remain *irresponsible* in its relationship to the community. Paradoxically, it may be the responsibility of the university, as occasion warrants, to bite the hand that feeds it. (Macpherson, 1968:99)

The university thus influences society and is influenced by it. Some particular interdependencies of the university with the community significantly modify goals and affect the president's role. There is the influence of the alumni described as a kind of "family" relationship. There is the impact of contractual research (to the extent that it is significant in volume) on curricula, faculty membership, facilities, and budgets. Accrediting bodies and professional associations in particular have their special influence on admission requirements, on academic standards and on curricula. The university may well be influenced both directly and indirectly by private donors or foundations. Academic institutions are subject to tendencies not typical in business: for example, that of outside groups applying pressure on the institution without accepting a commensurate obligation to support or contribute to it; and the intimacy with which the representatives of external agencies may operate in the decision-making councils of the institution. (Corson, 1960:35-38, 143-165) What the president is obliged to conclude is this:

> *If the [university] were wholly alien to its environment, it could not perform its function. . . . On the other hand, if it yields completely to its environment, it equally fails in its objectives. It must maintain a realistic contact without compromising its essential function. (Wriston, 1937:20)*

Other universities, too, are themselves a substantial element of the university's external environment, and influence the president in his articulation of goals. As Jacques Barzun points out, a single university can rarely afford changes or substantial modifications of its program lest these be interpreted as a dilution of proper standards. In more subtle ways, too, the influence of other institutions is felt. Without doubt, the University of Alberta, in its development during the decade of the sixties, was profoundly influenced by images held by its staff of such institutions as the

University of Chicago, Harvard and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Nor is the influence of other institutions measured solely in terms of emulation. A potential determinant of the course of affairs of an institution may well be organizational rivalry of the kind which so obviously existed between the University's Edmonton and Calgary campuses during the decade of the sixties.

Public and semi-public bodies have their impact on university goals and on the president's capacity to influence them. Indeed, to a much greater degree than was ever the case in the past, much of university planning is now undertaken by external authorities. In Canada, for example, such quasi-government agencies as the Massey Commission profoundly influenced development in the arts, humanities and social sciences, through its recommendations which led to the establishment of the Canada Council. (Canada, 1951) The Duff-Berdahl Commission, to which reference has been made above, emphatically influenced the reshaping of university government in Canada including the presidential role. In similar fashion, the federal government's review of science policy (Canada Senate Special Committee on Science Policy, 1971) will doubtless have major impact on research emphasis in the University of Alberta and other like institutions. Most recent in their impact on university institutions, and a source of constraint on the president in the discharge of his duties, are the Reports of such Royal Commission studies as have been instituted in Alberta, in Ontario, and in Manitoba among others.

But of paramount importance in the external environment in which the president functions is the role assumed by government. Sir William Mansfield Cooper, when Chancellor of the University of Manchester, crystallized the significance of the relationship between government and university thus: *It is useless to imagine that universities can be forever free from national pressures, political and social. It is useless, indeed dangerous, to imagine that university autonomy is something capable of definition in eternally comprehensive terms. It is useless to imagine that the elements of reciprocal influence and authority between university systems and others can ever be regarded as fixed. Nor can jurisdictions be regarded as fixed. Academic security can never come in this manner. Neither governments nor universities can hope to exempt themselves from . . . changes which it is . . their function to encourage. . . . There is some evidence that neither party has fully realized its role but, in my submission, the greater responsibility at*

this point of our history lies with the universities.
(Cooper, 1966:19-20)

The *pas de deux*, president with government, in the adjustment of the goals of his institution, is currently the most demanding performance required of the president. The failure to achieve agreement on the goals of the university, a possibility by no means in the realm of the fantastic, presents a forbidding alternative: the gradual take-over by the state of the heart of the institution. (Moos and Rourke, 1969)

The *internal* social world of the university, too, affects the president in his task of guiding his institution in its choice of goals. The formal structure of the organization — the organization chart — does not wholly describe it since, invariably, formal elements are supplemented by informal structure which reflects the personalities of individuals, each with special problems and interests.

Among the factors internal to the organization which tend to shape organizational goals and which make the clarification of goals a matter of complexity to the chief executive is the behaviour of its members. Empirical evidence of this relationship is scarce. Yet all academics will have observed that no small part of the problem of running a university may be traced to the predisposition of members of the academic community to interpret the same events quite differently. (Pfnister, 1970:9) The problems created by these different perceptions, of which the president is made aware in blunt or subtle ways, are often acute, particularly when faculty and administrative staff are the parties involved. Nor is it merely a matter of "poor communication," to use the stock phrase. The real difficulty is that, though individuals hear one another quite well, each has quite different interpretations of what it is he sees and hears. Faculty and administration members who live on the same premises, as Pfnister shrewdly observes, may not operate on the same premises. That judgment applies equally to the variety of faculties and schools which comprise the institution.

It is somewhat startling to realize that there may indeed be a wide gulf between men whose training, concerns, and values have lain in the general areas of scientific pursuits, and men of nontechnical background. . . . [To which can be added the] danger that the divergence of experience set[s] and harden[s] a real and fundamental dichotomy of attitudes and values between the two worlds, and encourage[s] an unbridgeable hostility between them.
(Haskins, 1960:147)

And, were this not complex enough, different units of the university may well support the same goals — but for different reasons.

Another element which almost certainly in the future in Canadian universities will affect the goal-determining processes of the institution and, inevitably, influence the character of the presidential role is the unionization of staff, academic and non-academic alike. At this point, one can only speculate on the effect, not merely on institutional goals but on structure, organization, finance, and presidential leadership, to say nothing of the more subtle potential influences on the spirit of the university — that elusive intangible which alone distinguishes its unique place in society.

University presidents and others who share in the administration of the institution confirm that colleagues tend to respond to problems in ways which can be categorized. Indeed, social scientists have informally classified participants within the organization in terms of the roles they play in it. Best known of these is Gouldner's (1957-58:448) portrayal of "Cosmopolitans" and "Locals" in reference to the degree of emotional attachment of certain academics to their institutional base. Within the Cosmopolitans are the *Outsiders* and the *Empire Builders*. Among the Locals—those close to the institutional base—are the supportive *Dedicated;* the *True Bureaucrats,* loyal to the place itself; and the *Home Guard,* who have the least subject specialization, who tend to be neither full-time researchers nor teachers, but rather administrators who do not occupy the highest administrative positions but are on the second or third rung. And there are the *Elders,* long-term members of the university with a deep, permanent, broadly known, often sentimental commitment to it. Other members in the typical organization are characterized as "unique troublemakers" (Moore, 1962); or in terms of how accepting the member is of the organization's efforts to dispose of his energies (Caplow, 1964); or according to a member's upward mobility within the organization, or his indifference to it (Presthus, 1962); or as he may be apathetic or erratic or Machiavellian or conservative (Sayles, 1958). Nor are these fictional characters; any university president could fit names to each.

It is on a stage peopled with these sociologists' caricatures, before an audience of the entire community, with all its vested interests, that the president performs his balancing act in which the star turn is his interpretation of university goals.

The President as Interpreter

The President of the University of Alberta, *primus inter pares* with his colleagues, is the principal spokesman of his institution.

He is the nexus of communication among its parts and its focus to the external community. His is the task of acting as the University's advanced listening post in the community. He is the officer who channels to his institution an impression of society's needs, opinions and uncertainties. His principal responsibility is to articulate the aspirations, intentions and concerns of the University to its constituencies. More than any other faculty member, and perhaps solely among his colleagues, his concern is for the institution *as a whole.*

It cannot be assumed with respect to any issue on which he speaks that he will reflect a universal agreement of his academic colleagues. That is unlikely. On the other hand, functioning as he does in the vortex of institutional affairs, his perceptions will in the main represent most of the University staff.

These views, his goals for the University, are to be found principally in his public speeches. The President's annual report to Convocation, which subsequently was included in the official report of the University to the government, tended during the 1960s to be a brief, factual account of development rather than an interpretation of institutional purpose. In what follows, the intent is to let excerpts of speeches, delivered over the decade of the sixties, themselves illuminate the sense of direction of the institution as perceived by its chief executive officer.

Following a synopsis of his general observations on the nature of the University, attention will be drawn to his views of curricula, teaching, research, graduate study and the University's continuing education function. His perceptions of the role of the

student body are followed by a review of his concept of university government, including the nature of the presidential office and of the special character of university administration. Thereafter, his analysis of the character of the University's external relationships, those with government and quasi-government agencies, with other institutions of higher education, with the community at large, and with underdeveloped countries, will be explored.

The Nature of the University: The Tasks of Higher Education

A useful point of departure for this examination of the intended direction of the University of Alberta as conceived by its chief executive officer is provided in a 1963 analysis of higher education presented to a British Columbia audience. Having sketched as backdrop something of the social and economic milieu of Canada, the President acknowledges the broad tasks assigned to higher education:

> *The need for general undergraduate and professional education is greater today by far than ever in our history, not only to meet the needs of our economy and our society but to prepare the young people of today for employment tomorrow.*
>
> *The need for graduate education to provide university and college teachers and the highly trained specialists we shall need in ever-increasing numbers is more urgent than ever before.*
>
> *As Canada has depended in the past on Britain, the United States, and Europe for the higher education of its young men and women especially at the graduate level, so we must take our share of responsibility in the future for the education of the young people of the newly emerging but still underdeveloped countries of the world today.*
>
> *Adult education, without reference to formal credits, degrees, or diplomas, must be planned not only to keep graduates of previous years abreast of recent developments in their professional fields, but also to introduce others to*

new interests and avocations to fill the leisure hours made possible by technology.

The new technical schools which have appeared all across the nation this year must be provided with the curricula and staff to permit them to meet the needs for technicians and skilled tradesmen for our growing economy in the modern world. (Johns, 1963c:4-5)

No order of priority in these is stipulated: each, he suggests, is important and all are interdependent.

In Alberta, at that time, few institutions existed to assist the University in these tasks. A network of community colleges and vocational schools had yet to emerge. Thus, for the time being, these responsibilities would require to be met principally out of the resources of Canadian universities.

I trust that we may regard it as axiomatic that the universities of our land do represent the gathering together of the best resources for intellectual pursuits of which they are capable. In them are to be found the accumulated wisdom of the ages on the shelves of their libraries, the resources for the creative advancement of scientific truth in their laboratories, and most important of all, the men and women who themselves are the agents for acquiring knowledge through the means of research, and for the dissemination of this knowledge to the coming generations. (Johns, 1962:2)

If there is a single theme which can be said to epitomize the President's conception of the purpose of university, it is that of the raising of the quality of civilization. . . . *If I were to write a modern educational catechism I should begin with the question "What is the chief aim of education?" and the answer I should give would be "To ennoble the individual man and woman and to improve society." Both these objectives are important and both are essential. We who are teachers (or have been teachers) welcome most eagerly those students who are brought to us by the sheer love of learning and are motivated by no base aspiration for a larger income or an easier life than their fathers knew, and yet in the end we hope that even these, whose desire to know is their chief motivation, will use their knowledge not only for their own satisfaction, but for the good of their fellow men. (Johns, 1967a:4)*

In an address to teachers, he reiterates that *education has as one of its main purposes the raising of the level of civilization—of those qualities which are the noblest attributes of man—kindness and*

courage, a love of truth and justice, and all such things. (Johns, 1968a:3)

The intellectual, moral and spiritual development of the student, rather than his acquisition of skills saleable in the marketplace, clearly ranks in first place as the responsibility of the university.

Curriculum and Teaching

With these general expressions of purpose, one turns to the President's view of particular institutional functions, beginning with the matter of curriculum and its linkage to teaching. The university's curriculum will change, and the technology adapted to it, but the relationship between teacher and pupil, he proposes, remains a constant.

When one surveys the long traditions of education from ancient Egypt through classical Greece and Rome, the Middle Ages, the Renaissance, the Industrial Revolution, and on down to the present day, he is aware of certain basic conditions which must always be present. Perhaps these can be summed up by saying they include first of all the existence of a body of knowledge and experience, and next the existence of older, wiser men or women with competence and zeal in imparting this information, and of a younger generation endowed with natural curiosity and a desire to learn. The curriculum may change, technology may introduce such aids as the printed book, radio and taped materials, television and other audio-visual tools, and even the teaching machine, but the teacher and the pupil must always remain as constant and fundamental elements in the business of education so that changes are often more apparent than real and more superficial than they may appear at first sight. (Johns, 1970:1)

But, while conceding the teacher-student relationship as a constant, the university must ensure that its curriculum is reflective of society's changes of direction.

Universities themselves will continue to adjust their programs to change their image from the isolation of the ivory tower or what Barzun calls "the ivory lab," to offer programs of greater

relevance to society and to foster greater involvement with the community. The clamour for "relevance" is one of the most insistent among today's undergraduates, and to a certain extent it may be justified. (Johns, 1970:6)

The maintenance of curriculum which is demonstrably in harmony with the felt needs of society is thus a continuing concern of the university though the task may not be easy.

This whole matter of relevance is one of the most difficult problems we face, and I hope that our Faculties of Arts and Science, particularly, will try to ensure that their offerings are relevant to the world we live in today. (Johns, 1968d:4)

Student unrest, he observes, reflects dissatisfaction with curricula. But he is not therefore prepared to accept that student judgment should determine curricula. On the contrary, he argues emphatically that in matters of curricula the faculty's decision should be supreme.

Student unrest is everywhere, and it is not over yet by any means. The reasons for it are many, and not always understood even by students themselves, but one reason is that they feel they have not sufficient choice in the matter of their curricula, their methods of learning, or their instructors. They may have legitimate complaints in all these areas, but we must be on our guard, in the interests of the students themselves, to see that their efforts at "reform" do not go too far. The average undergraduate may be able to offer reasonable criticism of his course of studies, but he certainly is not competent to draft a proper course himself, as is being done in some of the more "liberal" colleges in the United States. Dialogue on this subject should be permitted, but the decisions should lie with the Faculty, not the students. Faculty, on the other hand, should listen to student complaints and institute genuine reforms where they are clearly needed. (Johns, 1959b:6)

But recognition of the need for change in curriculum, he acknowledges, does not answer the question of what kind of change is desirable or how it ought to be planned. Decisions as to the shape and emphasis of the curriculum are invariably difficult.

There is another aspect of curriculum which causes a great deal of difficulty, viz. that of priority. The Academic Development Committee, for example, might find that there is a rapid increase in enrolment in a certain area in the University, such as Sociology or Art or Music. As the numbers of students grow, there is a growing demand for staff, for space, and for both operating and capital

funds. Should the Committee attempt to restrain development in such fields in the interest of promoting new areas such as the Speech Pathology and Audiology . . . or should we refrain from initiating new projects in times of financial stringency? Of course there is much to be said on both sides, but I feel that the one guiding light we must always keep in view is the interests of society as a whole. Some people may feel that the University is not competent to make such value judgments, but it seems clear to me that someone must make them and that if the University is not able to do it, we might as well give up any idea of progress or innovation. (Johns, 1969a:6)

Himself a scholar, the President expresses concern at scholasticism—the narrow adherence to traditional doctrine and method—and at what seems to him an imbalance between the sciences and the arts within his University.

I believe the evils of scholasticism are endemic in intellectual communities and have been particularly rampant in many places and many times since the Renaissance. They have appeared at Oxford and Cambridge in recent centuries; they have been prevalent in the great French and German universities, and they can appear in our universities and colleges today. . . . For this reason, I feel constrained to buttress my own concern for what I regard as the insidious growth of undue emphasis on science. . . .

Indeed, he continues: *Science today stands as one of the great cornerstones of our universities and is almost raised to the level of a religion. Research is regarded as the hand maiden of science in much the same way as the Muslims believe that "There is no God but God, and Mohammed is the prophet of God." (Johns, 1968c:3-4)*

The university, the President asserts, is a dynamic institution which has constantly to review the character of change in the society which has relevance for the university's work but has also to determine the order of priority to be assigned its various responsibilities. Thus, . . . *the universities of the world which are so deeply involved in education and training for our complex civilization must constantly assess and re-assess their changing responsibilities. We are deeply conscious of this necessity at the University of Alberta and have set up not only a Long-Range Planning Committee to try to discover what our tasks will be over the next twenty years and how to accomplish them, but we are also in the process of setting up an academic planning committee which will try to anticipate the changes in curricula and the new additions*

to our present pattern of education which we must recommend to the General Faculty Council and the Board of Governors for adoption. (Johns, 1961b:1)

It is only in very recent years that Canadian universities have paid any attention to the task of helping staff members, particularly new recruits, achieve some minimum range of skills as teachers. The operating assumption seemed to be that having gained some breadth in a subject area and accomplished a substantial piece of research, the university staff member was well enough prepared for the classroom. A major, continuing theme in the President's public addresses is the importance of teaching and the need to improve it.

The most expensive single element in most complex technological systems is the human being. Costs can be reduced and efficiency improved if the human being's output can be expanded by the aid of the machine—the conveyor belt, the earth mover, the freight handler, the electronic computer, or the television screen. Industry is constantly in search of new ways of replacing manpower for routine and repetitive work. Scientists in their laboratories are constantly inventing new devices to improve their competence in the analysis of complex chemical compounds. Why should we not look for improvement in the teaching process? (Johns, 1961c:5)

His concern at the relegation of teaching to the academic periphery and what seemed to him the unwarranted primacy of research and publication is evident in an address to the Red Deer College.

The universities today are havens for free inquiry—and so they should remain—but they should also be centres of teaching as well as of learning. There is a way of life epitomized in the phrase "publish or perish" for the academic world which requires that each person in the modern college must perforce add his own share of the contributions to the mountains of information that already reach the height of Mount Everest and are growing larger every minute. Is there to be no place for the scholar or the scientist who might wish to study this vast pile of ore to find the precious metal in it? Is there to be no place for the person who considers it his task to pass on to the students in his classroom the results of this enormous activity for their use and comfort? (Johns, 1964d:5)

Unease at the imbalance between the teaching and research functions of the university coupled to a view of the essential purpose of the university is again expressed in a 1960 address to the Canadian Psychiatric Association.

Let us keep research alive and the lively curiosity that prompts it, but let us not make our universities mere quarries for mining more solid pieces of knowledge. Let us make them also places of light and learning where knowledge is broadly diffused and applied to the betterment of mankind and of the human spirit. (Johns, 1960c:11)

In still another elaboration of this theme, he declares that *we must not, at our peril, neglect the world of the spirit. . . .*

Are we meeting this challenge effectively? I think that at the University of Alberta I might offer a qualified "Yes." My qualification is due to the fact that we may not be preserving a fair balance between teaching and research, for like most major Universities today we are committed to a heavy programme of Graduate education, and this involves our senior Faculty being heavily committed to research, with the result that the intimate contact between these people and undergraduates is extremely limited. (Johns, 1968:d1-2)

Teaching, the President reiterates again and again, is a great art to which increasing attention must be paid. Acknowledging that the lecture as a mode of teaching has fallen into disrepute among students, he recognizes *that at least [the lecture] has the virtue of economy in permitting one instructor to pass on to many students the accumulated knowledge of the preceding centuries. (Johns, 1967a:3)*

But, with an eye both to the improvement of teaching, to the awkward shortage of university teachers in almost all subjects, and to possible economies in instruction, he proposes the harnessing of modern technology to instruction: *Some form of economizing will have to be found. To a generation of scientists that has produced as many marvels as ours, surely this is not an insuperable problem. We use electronic computers, electron microscopes and mass spectrometers in our research. Why should we not use the language lab (as we do now) and the television screen in our classrooms to meet the shortage of teaching staff? We might even effect some monetary economies at the same time. (Johns, 1961a:6)*

Research

A dominant strain in the President's view of research as a basic university function is evident in many of his public addresses: the balance which should be assigned to it relative to the university's other responsibilities. In a speech to the Institute of Public Administration, he points to the *raison d'être* of university research.

The main argument for encouraging and assisting research at universities is that it is only at universities (or chiefly at universities) that . . . research is associated with teaching students, particularly at the graduate level. Today the development of graduate studies is assuming a tremendous importance due not only to the growing complexity of our society, our economy, and our technology, but to the need for advancing knowledge at the higher levels and supplying the staff who are willing and able to perform this function. (Johns, 1963b:6)

But while the role of research within the university and its contribution to society is plainly evident, the relative emphasis placed on it within the institution appears to the President to be radically out of joint.

One of the outstanding attributes of man is curiosity, though it is by no means exclusively his own, among the members of the animal kingdom. Most animals that I have known possess it and I have seen it in cattle, horses, dogs, cats, and other domestic animals, and even in a number of wild animals. It cannot, therefore, be regarded as one of the great humanizing forces in the world. It does, however, characterize our scientific life today, as it has done through all of recorded history. The scientists talk proudly of their tremendous achievements, which have given us the aeroplane, radio and television, lasers, masers, and the hydrogen bomb. All this has created among our professional scientists a passion for what they call "research" and has raised it to the level of a fanatic religion. Certainly we can justify a tremendous concentration of scientific acumen on such problems of medicine as a cure for cancer or cardio-vascular disease, and we must try to improve the potential of the earth and the sea to produce food for mankind. These I support in the interests of humanity. But, why in the name of Heaven should we spend billions of dollars and the efforts of our greatest minds to fly higher and faster and farther when we often don't know what to do

when we get there. Why should we spend millions to improve our communications systems when we are forgetting how to communicate with our next door neighbours or the members of our own family? These can have little or no justification in the interests of humanity, and yet our children are being indoctrinated with this religious fervor for scientific research to the detriment of their studies in the great literary and historical records of man's achievement. (Johns, 1968a:4)

Continuing in this vein in an address to the 1967 meeting of the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada, a major forum of his peers, he declares with considerable courage that *no self-respecting community of scholars today would deny that research is an important function of a university and none would be so bold as to deny the importance of the teaching function. I have felt for some years, however, that too many of our best minds have been so devoted to the pursuit of knowledge for its own sake that they have refused to consider how this pursuit can be justified except as an end in itself. This view has crystallized into dogma and I know that anyone who dares to question dogma is branded as a heretic. (Johns, 1967d:3)*

In the same mood, but on this occasion expressing himself to his colleagues of the University of Alberta (as was his custom annually), he argues that *today it would be heretical even to question the value of research in a university and I would readily agree that a great deal of research done in universities is of value to society in a great many ways. But the passion for research solely for the sake of research has gone beyond the limits of reason in some cases . . . In making such a statement I shall probably be charged with being a heretic and there will be many a Torquemada who would be prepared to sentence me to be burned at the stake—figuratively at least. But I do feel that we should periodically review our prime objectives and the means by which they can be best achieved. The genuine enquiring mind bent on exploring new frontiers of knowledge is a university's most precious possession. The uninspired labourer in the vineyard who has neither the desire nor the competence to carry out his researches to good purpose had best transfer his interest to other tasks.*

And he concludes on this positive and conciliatory note:

The measure of the work of an individual in any field is to be found in a variety of ways and I hope each of us is willing to indulge in sufficient introspection to decide how he can best render service to

this university community and the world in which we live. If it is really in research, we shall support his efforts. If it is in teaching we shall do the same. I hope we can even recognize his talents if he feels he can contribute in administration and thus render the work of the research scholar and the teacher more effective. (Johns, 1967b:10)

His dismay and anxiety at the pre-eminence given research in the contemporary university aside, he has specific misgivings about research methodology in the humanities and social sciences and especially its reliance on the application of the "scientific method." With respect to psychology in particular, he suggests that an "enormous amount of effort is based to too great an extent on the so-called scientific method" which, he suggests, leads to oversimplification in explanation and a mechanistic interpretation of human action. (Johns, 1968c) Speaking to his audience of educators, he deplores the social sciences' contemporary emphasis on the use of statistics, sharing the distaste of Emmet John Hughes of Rutgers at the "pervasive notion that a true perception of the life of a people depends less on understanding than upon the science of computing." (Hughes, 1976)

Today, instead of studying the political systems of the past and the present and analyzing them, there is a school of thought which believes that more can be achieved by creating models and by shifting the component parts about to achieve an ideal synthesis. Surely, much more could be learned by the student in studying the problems faced by previous generations of statesmen in our country and other countries by seeing how they sought to solve their problems and whether they succeeded or failed, and finally why.

History and literature alike, along with philosophy and other disciplines which rightfully belong in the Humanities, have been treated "in the scientific manner" by too many scholars, with the result that students have been alienated from these fields forever. It may be to the advantage of the entomologist and it may serve to advance knowledge to dissect a butterfly, or to a botanist to dissect a flower, but surely this should not be the universal approach. Some of us, at least, should try to see the beauty in the object, and not merely the anatomical structure. (Johns, 1968a:10)

The theme that frequently reappears is this: that the university has as its responsibility to interpret research findings and their relation to the human condition. The pursuit of knowledge for the sake of knowledge, he insists, ought to be questioned. *I think we have reached the stage in our scientific progress in which we should*

ask "why?" more often. Perhaps the mountain climber may justify his hobby by saying he wants to climb a mountain "because it is there," but why should we spend countless millions of dollars and immense amounts of scientific knowledge and effort to reach the moon? I certainly don't know the answer. Perhaps some of the scientists do. (Johns, 1964d:2)

A further dimension of his concern is the effect of the set of interrelationships involved in research — publication, personal advancement, and the growth of professionalism with all its trappings, within the disciplines — to the organizational needs of the university institution itself.

In order to keep abreast of the research done by his colleagues in his own field and to add to that research himself, a staff member must devote more and more time and energy to the point where the acquisition of wisdom in its broadest sense and the transmission of knowledge to students in a form they can assimilate become almost interruptions in his main program for existence. Everyone, even university professors, cherishes the respect of his peers and today this respect can only be gained by productive research. Administrators tend to weigh the merits of their teaching colleagues on a scale in which the number of pages of published research and the nature of the journals in which they are published are the main indicators. The admonition to the young faculty member of "publish or perish" is no mere jest. For his reputation not only in his own institution, but farther afield, is made or lost on the basis of his personal bibliography.

Each age and each social sub-group has its status symbols and those most revered in modern academic communities, besides the bibliography mentioned above, are the numbers of graduate students and the size of research grants. In the scales applied here, Ph.D. students, of course, count for more than master students, and post-doctoral fellows count highest of all. Reputations are made most often by those who spend most time away from their home campuses and a man's ranking in the academic hierarchy is in inverse proportion to the number of hours a week he teaches and the number of students for whom he is personally responsible. (Johns, 1967a:6)

All of these issues, as the President acknowledges, are bound up in the graduate school of the University. The drive to graduate school development was by far the most significant thrust of the period, involving as it did the extension of curricula, the recruitment of both staff and students, and the expansion of libraries and laboratories.

The pressures forcing the rapid development of graduate work at the University of Alberta are recorded in several of the President's public addresses. In the first place, there was the pressing need of universities to produce instructors for the seemingly ever-increasing population of undergraduates.

> *For many years, most Canadian universities have been content to offer undergraduate programs in general education and in the professional schools, leaving to the larger universities in the United States and Great Britain the task of graduate education and research. In Canada, little work to the Ph.D. level was done outside McGill and Toronto until recently. This situation is rapidly changing today for a number of reasons. As Canada's industry and commerce develop and her need for highly trained men increases, we have suddenly become aware of the fact that our best young men, who have gone to the United States for graduate study, have been remaining there to begin their careers. This is a kind of export which is likely to have serious repercussions if it is not stopped. Not only do we need these young men in commerce and industry, in government and the professions, but we need them desperately in our universities and colleges and also in our secondary schools. (Johns, 1960c:5-6)*

Indeed, of all the factors forcing the development of graduate work at the University of Alberta, it seemed to the President that the staffing requirements of burgeoning Canadian universities, his own included, were dominant.

> *. . . Student-staff ratios may vary, but the figure of 15 students to each member of the teaching staff is one we may use for calculating the needs of the future. This would mean, then, that by 1970 we shall require 1000 staff and by 1980 over 1500. With the increasing demand for Ph.D.'s in government and industry and the limited number turned out of our graduate schools, it seems likely that we shall be in difficulties in the matter very soon. The National*

Educational Association in the U.S. pointed out that the proportion of Ph.D.'s in the newly appointed staffs in the U.S. dropped from 31.4% in 1953 to 23.8% in 1958. We used to feel that we could attract all the staff we needed from the graduate schools of the U.S., the U.K., and eastern Canada. It is perfectly obvious that these days are gone forever, though we still do recruit some from all these sources. One of the important aspects of the problem is that all over the world new colleges and universities are being created which will demand more and more qualified staff but will produce none of their own. This will lay still heavier burdens on such universities as ours to carry on the necessary graduate education and research themselves. (Johns, 1961a:5-6)

Nor was it only the higher education system which required the product of the graduate school. Government, business and the professions each had their demands on its output.

Clearly, the President shared the public concern of the day for the "brain drain" to the United States. *It is a fact too well known to need emphasis here that many of our best young men who went to the United States for graduate education in the past thirty years are today leaders in the business, professional, and political life of the United States. Not only are we at the University of Alberta and in other of the major universities in Canada dedicated to stopping this drain on our most important resources, but we are deeply conscious of the fact that we must provide our own graduate study or face a critical shortage of men and women to teach in our universities and colleges and to provide the highly-specialized personnel for development and leadership in industry, commerce, and government. (Johns, 1961b:5).*

The President was keenly aware how tightly the reputation of the University was tied to its graduate school, the development of which would subtly but surely shape the future directions of the whole of the institution.

Our Faculty have brought distinction to the University in many ways over the past year or two and the reputation of the University is growing by leaps and bounds. There is evidence of this in the enormous increase in applications for graduate scholarships and assistantships, in visits to the campus by people from the academic world in many countries, and by the honours that have been accorded staff members. . . . The list of similar honours is too long to give in detail here, but I can assure you that the reputation of

the University of Alberta is growing as it has never grown before. (Johns, 1965a:7)

But graduate school development, while a goal of the greatest importance, ought not to be met at the expense of standards. Moreover, its development must attempt to anticipate a future in which technology was applied in wholesale fashion to the expansion of access to education.

We must expand our graduate schools at an unprecedented rate. This is expensive and difficult and we must not do it at the expense of standards. We must ensure that our most competent staff are permitted to concentrate on graduate teaching and research, and we must provide scholarships and fellowships of adequate size and numbers to induce our ablest students to go forward to the doctorate and to carry on post-doctoral studies in many fields. We must recognize the necessity for the use of the new technological advances to enlarge the scope of instruction of our best professors through television, either live or from video tape. This will involve a program of co-operation between universities on a national scale if it is to succeed. It is not difficult to envisage that one of the greatest industries in the coming years will be the production of such courses of instruction on a national basis with new lecture programs being produced almost every year, for the rate of obsolescence in the rapidly changing field of science will be high. (Johns, 1963c:6-7)

It was not his judgment, however, that all departments of the University should engage in graduate-level work. Indeed, because of the cost involved in the development of graduate work, some limitation in the rate of its growth in Alberta and thus some balance in the extent of its development on the two campuses, Edmonton and Calgary, was required.

It is, of course, not possible to develop graduate study to the level of the Doctorate in all Departments, nor should this be attempted. The Survey Committee therefore recommend . . . that the work of the Faculty of Graduate Studies on the Edmonton campus be consolidated and confirmed, but that the areas of such development be limited in number.

It would not be economical to attempt a substantial development of Graduate Studies on both campuses at this time. (Johns, 1963a:3)

Nor, the President recognized, ought the development cost of graduate work to the University of Alberta to be assessed only in terms of money. In one respect, the forced growth of the graduate

school had a negative effect on undergraduate instruction. [*The undergraduates*] *feel that they are being slighted by the best talent in the Faculty, and are being crowded into larger classes where they lose their identity and have no opportunity for dialogue with their Professor. Any opportunities that do arise in this area come from their contacts with graduate students who, if not actually teaching classes themselves, are expected to assist in the marking of essays, lab. reports, tests, and even final examinations as well as holding tutorials with the undergraduates. (Johns, 1969a:7)*

Public Service

The public service function and the institution's willingness to meet community needs in the education of adults is the object of only occasional reference in the President's addresses. In a speech early in his tenure of office, he acknowledges the importance of this responsibility. But while conceding the value of programs of informal education, he suggests that one of the ways in which universities can best assist, is in providing more programs of study at a professional level and new programs in such fields as personnel management, production engineering, and public administration. (Johns, 1961a:9) Somewhat in amplification is his 1963 statement to the newly created Lethbridge Community College:

Adult education, without reference to formal credits, degrees, or diplomas, must be planned not only to keep graduates of previous years abreast of recent developments in their professional fields, but also to introduce others to new interests and avocations to fill the leisure hours made possible by technology. (Johns, 1963e:5)

In the peak years of growth and change of Canadian universities, the middle years of the decade, the President is acutely aware that among the responsibilities pressed on the university institution is the continued educational upgrading of members of society.

The field of adult education is one of increasing importance as the statistics of enrolment show. If the growing needs in this field are to be met, the burden laid on the universities and the secondary schools will be immense; since it will be imposed in addition to that

of the education of the regular student body. It is, however, a burden that many university staff members will bear cheerfully in the same spirit with which they faced the task of teaching the returning veterans after World War II. (Johns, 1963c:8-9)

But, on another occasion, he candidly acknowledges that *universities are naturally strongly conservative and by their very nature seem reluctant to take on new responsibilities for education of the kind that society demands and it is only when the demand becomes clamorous that university faculties and administrators listen and heed it.*

I am happy to say that most universities will have at least one department which is more alert than others to these vital needs of society. These are the Departments of Extension. And it is through their efforts that we frequently find a beginning made in the provision of courses for the newly emerging professional groups. This is a work of great importance and one which will receive increasing recognition in the years immediately ahead of us—perhaps in centres other than universities. (Johns, 1961b:6)

The Student Body

The President's view of the role of the student body is pinpointed in an address to the students themselves in their own modern Union building: *It is basic to my thinking about student leadership that universities exist for teaching and research and that students attend for the purpose of widening their intellectual horizons, learning about man, his culture, his nature, and his aims, about the world around us, biological and physical, and in many cases learning a profession by study and practice. (Johns, 1967c:1)* Returning to an earlier theme, he recounts to the Senate the relationship of student and professor.

So while professors convene in universities to teach and to enlarge their own knowledge—indeed to expand the frontiers of knowledge—students assemble there to learn. If this is not their objective they should not be at university. It is characteristic of youth in all ages that they should challenge the accepted dogmata of their elders and such challenges at least have the virtue of insisting

that the older generations constantly re-check their data and, at times, revise their conclusions drawn from these data. But students who spend all their time in challenging and neglect the hard process of learning do little good, whether for themselves or their contemporaries. (Johns, 1967a:3)

The record of that decade confirms that, in contrast to the environment on many another university campus, reasonable and stable relations of students with teachers and administration had generally characterized the University of Alberta, a fact which the President acknowledges in his annual address to the staff in 1968.

Another aspect of our life at the University that should be mentioned is the existence of harmonious relations, in the main, between the students and that amorphous body known as "The Administration." This has not been easy to maintain in the face of a constant and vociferous barrage of criticism . . . [the achievement of university objectives] can only be done effectively through an administrative structure that provides the means for each person—teacher, students, and supporting staff—to participate in the work of the University in the manner appropriate to his role. . . .

No university can exist without students, and we want them to have an opportunity to share in the decisions that are important to them. To this end the Universities Act *provides for a Council on Student Affairs, we have three students on our General Faculty Council, and students are represented on a great many of the University Committees. (Johns, 1968b:3-4)*

The Organization and Administration of the University

Of considerable interest is the President's analysis of the problems of administration experienced by a modest provincial institution catapulted into the status of a complex multiversity.

Few tasks in modern society demand more of the man than leadership of the modern university, as the perennial list of presidential vacancies and the memoirs of presidents *emeriti* attest. In somewhat sardonic vein, the President introduces the role of the chief executive officer in the modern university thus:

What is the administration of a university? To many of the

Faculty it is perhaps personified in an individual who, like Philip II of Spain, lurking in the Escurial, sits alone or with a group of lackeys around him and weaves plots to stultify and obstruct the honorable and noble aspirations of his staff, or spends his time appearing at public functions or making speeches in which he takes all the credit for the efforts of those who are the real heart and soul of the university. In any case, according to popular belief, he comes to this high office of great emolument by trampling on a host of abler and wiser men.

In actual fact he is much more likely to be an honest citizen who was induced to take on the burdens of his office against his better judgment and who spends his days trying to hear the voice of truth amid harsh and strident clamours from all sides for special consideration for present needs and future plans. (Johns, 1963b:2)

Speaking to a student conference on leadership, he poses three criteria of leadership which, from his experience, express the requirements of the presidential office.

There are three attributes I would assign not only to student leaders but to leaders everywhere:

Competence
Willingness to Serve
Reluctance to Seek Power

There is no question as to the need for competence. The leader must be wiser and more experienced and abler than his fellows. He must have tact to lead instead of drive, he must know what is best for society and must seek it out, he must be patient in the face of difficulties and disappointments, and he must have initiative and vigor. Above all he must have vision.

He must be willing to serve. No one should accept responsibility for an office unless he is prepared to devote himself without stint to the good of his fellow men. Furthermore, if a man or woman finds that the office is too much for them they should retire from it with as much speed and grace as possible for the position is important and deserves the best that its occupier can give it.

I have taken as my third point that a leader should be reluctant to seek power. Too many people today seek power boldly and without shame and such people should be looked on with suspicion and avoided at all costs by the electorate. (Johns, 1967c:2-3)

The functions of the office, as he perceived them, are suggested in his "Inaugural Address" of 1959. The university president must act to co-ordinate and implement decisions of the several deliberate bodies of the university as quickly and as effectively as possible. His is the obligation to assist the staff in every way possible to fulfil its teaching responsibility. It is the president's duty to encourage and support imagination and initiative among his academic colleagues in whatever tasks they might perform. He who occupies the presidential office had not, he proposes from classical history, "the kind of *imperium* accorded to senior Roman magistrates" with which to regulate all of the affairs of an institution as complex and richly endowed with talents as a modern university. Rather, the university president, he concluded, is "an engineer of consensus."

It is of interest to note that he emphasizes this aspect of his role with reference both to the internal and the external environments of the institution. (Johns, 1969c:3) The duty of interpreting the university to his colleagues on the campus and, equally to those external to it is clearly seen as a very important presidential task, a view underscored by the very volume of his public addresses.

He must be concerned with the planning of new developments through the Campus Planning Committee and the appropriate government departments, and he must try to keep a balance, not only in the budget, but in the many Departments of the University as well. He must convince the Faculty that he is an expert at procuring funds for the university's needs, he must convince the Government that he is exercising every possible economy; he must convince the Alumni and the general public that he is building the greatest university in the world and he must convince his neighbors adjacent to the campus that he is a good neighbor and not a space-devouring monster. At times these various roles inevitably come into conflict, but at least no university administrator can ever complain that time hangs heavy on his hands or that his life lacks interest or challenge. (Johns, 1963b:8)

The President does not appear to believe that the responsibilities of his office could effectively be discharged by a non-academic. Even those functioning as assistants to the chief executive officer must know the subtleties of the university institution.

Few presidents of Canadian universities have enough administrative help. One reason is that it is difficult to find men who have the necessary combination of understanding of University

problems and of the point of view of the faculty and the students, and yet have the experience and training necessary for routine administrative work. They could perhaps be found among the faculty, but most such men of outstanding administrative ability fill important roles in the teaching departments, and they should be taken from this work only if no other solution to the administrative problems of the President's office can be found. (Johns, 1960a:3)

A basic tenet of university regulation is reflected in the statement that *so far as government is concerned I believe most sincerely the less government we have the better. Dictators, kings, or chiefs too often use their power for their own ends—to gain wealth or privilege, or worst of all simply to grasp and exercise power to satisfy their own egos. (Johns, 1967c:2)*

It will be recollected that a rapid decentralization of power characterized the Canadian campus during the decade of the sixties. The locus of power was no longer exclusively in the Board of Governors, the General Faculty Council, or the presidential office. As the President recognized in a 1962 address, *it is true that the various Faculties in a great and growing modern university tend more and more to manage their own affairs in the realms of curriculum and general regulations. (Johns, 1962:3)*

This faculty and departmental self-regulation extended to university budgeting. New flexibility in operation was now afforded deans and department heads. (Johns, 1963d:3) But the danger inherent in such devolution of authority is clearly foreseen:

All professions are constantly in danger of so emphasizing their own special functions that, in planning their curricula, they tend to proliferate courses devoted to a study of these special functions to the detriment of their program of study as a whole. This danger is particularly apparent in the cases of those groups which have most recently acquired that community of interest and breadth of organization which characterizes the professions.

In the same address, and with respect to a particular faculty, he cautions, . . . *let them beware lest, in their passion for their particular subjects they pay more attention to the paraphernalia of the workshop or the jargon of the journals than to the genuine search for the true and the good . . . and the intellectual and moral advancement of our age. (Johns, 1962:4, 13)*

The interweaving of relationships of the various bodies comprising the University and a growing demand from staff and students and, occasionally, the public for participation in the

University's decision making is the subject of a 1966 address to the Council of Professions. *Here, as in so many other cases, it is important to see the proper role of each member of the university community as appropriate to itself. The student's role is to study, that of the Faculty is to teach and carry on research, and that of the Governors is to provide the means by which the first two groups can best carry out their functions. Of course, each must make its needs known to the other and communication is vital. This does not mean, however, that the roles should be confused. Each has much to learn from the other, but each should concentrate on doing his own job and doing it well. The passion for "participation in decision making" can be carried to extremes to the detriment of other more appropriate functions (Johns, 1966b:7)*

In an address to an audience comprising students, staff and legislators in 1969, the President comments on the dissidence which characterized universities internationally. Because by its very nature the University institution is bound to hear all sides of every question, it is itself vulnerable to those in its own ranks. Both staff and students might well attempt to serve their personal conception of society's ends—or their own purposes or ambitions.

It is at this point that the University is particularly vulnerable, when it takes a position that all sides of every question must be heard, for it means that the universities have attracted to our communities persons whose object is not to seek the truth, but to disseminate and propagate their particular political or social ideology. . . .

Much has been said about the dangers of interference from governments, from business and industry, and from religious or other organizations. Nothing has been said about the hazards that universities experience from ideological propagandists who not only seek to subvert a search for truth with calmness and objectivity, but often, in the quest of their purposes, incite to violence, with such results as we have recently seen at San Francisco State College, and only yesterday at Sir George Williams University and the University of Windsor in Canada. (Johns, 1969b:3)

Though nowhere in an organization chart of the institution is that group of staff members which comprise "the administration" clearly identified, there is continuing reference to it. Its collective function, in the view of the President, "is to assist the faculty member to perform this task [of instruction and advances in human knowledge] to the best of his ability." It is, further, *the responsibility*

of the administration in consultation with many committees and many individuals to apportion [financial resources] . . . in such a way that it will be of the greatest advantage to the university and ultimately to society as a whole. This involves the application of value judgments, which are often difficult to reach. It also involves that "infinite capacity for taking pains" that characterizes so much of the administrator's life and work. (Johns, 1963b:6-7)

In his analysis of institutional structure and administration, the President returns once again to the impact of professionalism within departments in the modern university and the signs of conflict between the discipline and the interests of the institution as a whole. *The passion to contribute to the rapidly growing mountains of accumulated knowledge has caught us in its grip, and professors of today are often more concerned with research than with teaching, with attending international conferences of their fellows than imparting knowledge to undergraduates, with seeing the lists of their publications grow than inspiring their junior colleagues or their students at any level. (Johns, 1964a:2)*

The University, the President reported to its supporters, had become too complex for comfort. A reflection of this complexity was a tendency to paralysis in the decision-making process (Johns, 1968b:4), this despite the clear lines of responsibility and levels of authority —worked out on paper—by the Board of Governors for its committees and administrative officers. As it affected his own duties, he admits that *one of the great problems that the University President has today is to keep track of proposals as they move from one committee to another, and ultimately come to the Council or Board where decision is finally possible.*

In illustration, he relates that *in the area of curriculum . . . a proposal may be initiated by a single individual for a single course. It must then be considered by the Executive Committee of the Department, by the Department as a whole, by the Executive Committee of the Faculty, by the Faculty as a whole, by the Executive Committee of General Faculty Council, and possibly by General Faculty Council itself. . . .*

But even then the course might *have farther to go. (Johns, 1969a:5-6)*

This requirement of broad consultation on all issues is exacerbated by differences of opinion among his colleagues as to the goals which the institution should pursue. For example, speaking with reference to the allocation of existing budget funds, he reports

that while some of his colleagues argue that *library growth must be increased at all costs; others insist on special support for graduate students and post-doctoral fellows; others on special Chairs for distinguished professors; and still others for a general increase in salaries and such perquisites as free parking structures or more liberal allowances for travel or sabbatical leave.* concluding, wistfully perhaps, that *somewhere, sometime, we shall have to establish critical priorities in these matters. (Johns, 1968b:7)*

Quite clearly, in his opinion, *one of our greatest difficulties . . . is that of achieving a common agreement on the part of all concerned as to what the University's objectives should be and how they can be met. . . . Unfortunately, those of us who are completely involved in university work find it difficult to see the point of view of others and to help others to see our own point of view. (Johns, 1963h:1)*

This complexity in the University's administrative process, he records, puts severe demands on the President's time. But necessarily in the forefront of his duties as President, indeed, his paramount function, is that of interpreting the University to the community and of acting as a channel of communication among groups interested in its affairs. *The difficulties faced by Presidents are many, by no means all of them originating on the campus. He is in demand by Alumni (quite properly), and by political, social, and cultural organizations from the community in which he lives. You might say that he should turn down these invitations and save his time and his energies for his main task. I can only say, with all the force at my command, that if the President does not keep close and friendly liaison with the constituency which his university serves, and which supports that university, the harm done to the institution will be very serious indeed. I know there are persons here this evening who will scoff at this as ridiculous, but I submit that it is absolutely true, and can easily be substantiated. (Johns, 1969c:3)*

Not surprisingly and, perhaps, inevitably, the growth of the institution during the decade was characterized by its accretion of bureaucracies and campus agencies only distantly related to its essential functions. In his annual address to the staff association of 1966, the President provides a rough accounting of the University's expenditure for the year, noting that "one of the features of a rapidly expanding campus such as ours is the need to spend so much time and effort and such a vast amount of money on projects which seem to have little relation to the educational process itself." Some three

years later, he again pleads the necessity to keep the central role of the university—teaching—central. His files, he reported then, were full of requests for funds for the support of activities of a variety of kinds which, desirable though they might be, were expensive and often peripheral. His judgment of the possible consequences following out of this encrustation of institutional adjuncts is prophetic. *They may have great merit for the cause of science or scholarship, but they cost immense amounts of money which, in the event of financial stringency, might have to come from funds for teaching or students. I hope we can keep our sights on our main purpose and not become too obsessed with other objectives. (Johns, 1969c:7)*

In his evaluation of the impact of the rapid growth of Canadian universities generally during the decade, the President appears ambivalent. In a 1963 address, speaking of the problems caused by forced growth, he remarks that *I am sure you all know at least some universities in Canada which are trying desperately to build up their enrolment and their facilities to the point where they outstrip another university or simply try to surpass their own statistics of growth. A criterion should be the needs of the community for higher education and not mere size. It is encouraging to note that a number of institutions in Canada have set their sights on quality instead of quantity and are determined to remain as close to their present size as possible. (Johns, 1963f:3)*

Yet, two years later, he is prepared to concede that *the growth of higher education in this country may entail difficulties of many kinds but we cannot inhibit this growth except as a last resort if we are to meet the needs of our increasingly complex economy and technology. (Johns, 1965b:5)*

This view he confirms in the year following: *You may well ask whether the University* should *go on growing as it has done in the past five years. I believe the answer must be "YES," because I believe with complete conviction that the solutions of our ills in Canada and the world at large depend on an ever increasing number of well educated young people. There is hardly a single profession in this country that is not short of members—and some are desperately short. With universal medical care in prospect, we shall be short of medical and paramedical staff—doctors, nurses, dentists, physical and occupational therapists, pharmacists, and medical laboratory technicians. More critical still will be the shortage of highly trained staff to teach the students. It appears that space for these programs*

will be provided in the coming years on a really lavish scale. (Johns, 1966c:2)

The autonomy of the University of Alberta's branch at Calgary was a contentious issue during the decade. The view of the President was that while autonomy should come eventually, the University at both Edmonton and Calgary should continue under a single Board of Governors. Autonomy for the southern campus should come when it had reached the point at which it could function satisfactorily as a separate entity. *The Calgary Herald*, echoing the citizens of that city, held a conflicting view as to when that might be.

Consistent with his opinion on the Calgary matter was the President's judgment with respect to the development of a second university in the Edmonton area. As he confided to the St. Albert Chamber of Commerce, *you will have come to the conclusion that I would be reluctant to favour a separate institution for this area when our present facilities are completely absorbed. I would favour instead an ancillary campus for reasons of effective instruction for our students and economy for those who must meet the costs.*[1] *(Johns, 1966c:8)*

The University in its External Relationships

The President, in his speeches, returned again and again to the University in its external relationships.

---

[1]In 1970, however, it was decided to establish a separate university, Athabasca, to be situated at St. Albert, a town lying some ten miles north and west of Edmonton. In a letter to the author, of March 10, 1972, the former President writes:

I always felt that the University of Calgary should be supported in an organic growth process, along with The University of Alberta in Edmonton. Development at Calgary was consonant with my firm views on the decentralization of University work throughout the province, and Calgary was obviously a major growth area in this development. . . .

. . . I began, in the middle of my tenure of office as President, to move for the development of a second campus in Edmonton, and wrote a great many letters to a succession of Ministers of Education to this effect, beginning about 1964 or 1965.

Higher education, he acknowledged in an annual statement to the staff, *should be directed to the needs of society in ever widening circles extending from our immediate constituency here in Alberta to the farthest regions of this earth. We should see this service not in a narrow provincial view but in the widest possible context consistent with our proper share of what is a world-wide effort. (Johns, 1967b:8-9)*

The degree to which an institution is able to meet such a responsibility would, in part, reflect its funding which, during the period was almost entirely provided by the federal and provincial governments.

The responsibility of governments to support universities is based on two main arguments. First, they share with corporations the obligation to support the source of so many of their best recruits. As governments at all levels take on more and more responsibility for the welfare of their citizens, they need better trained men and women for these great tasks, and these they look to universities to provide. Secondly, as custodians of public funds to be disbursed for the good of society as a whole, they must regard universities as one of the most important means of serving society. (Johns, 1960d:2)

But in an address to a chamber of commerce in 1966, he states his belief that the responsibility of financial support to higher education was not that of provincial governments alone. *Higher education in many of the professional fields, and particularly in graduate studies, is really a nation-wide concern and I regret the departure of the federal government from this sphere very much. (Johns, 1966c:3)*

Until 1966, the relationship of the University to the provincial government was direct. Such consultation as was necessary took place between the Board of Governors or the President on the one hand and the Minister of Education or the Cabinet on the other. But with the promulgation in 1966 of *The Universities Act* an intermediate agency, the Universities Commission, and an inter-university body, the Universities' Co-ordinating Council, were established. The existence of these required the development of new sets of relationships which, the President acknowledges, brought new sets of concerns in their train.

There are problems, too, in the broader sphere of the Universities' Co-ordinating Council and its relation to The Universities Commission and to the Board of Post-Secondary Education. Should a University be given free rein to embark on an

extension in Graduate Studies on its own, or should it secure concurrence of the other two universities in the Province, through the Co-ordinating Council, or should the Universities Commission investigate the matter thoroughly and grant or withhold its approval? We are trying to resolve this problem at the present time, but unanimous agreement seems difficult to obtain. (Johns, 1968b:5)

Essentially, the problem inviting solution was the manner of mediating the aspirations of the three provincial universities and of reconciling their ambitions both with competing claims on the province's tax dollars and the growing demand for alternative opportunities in higher education. What was required to harmonize and forward the growth of all Alberta universities, the President proposed, was "one clear plan for the development of higher education in the Province."

His review of the emerging system of higher education in Alberta in 1961, presented to the University's staff, confirms the urgency the President attached to the development of additional centres of post-secondary education in Alberta and across Canada. But, while calling for an expansion in the number of post-secondary institutions across the province, the President seemed to favour centralization in university organization and the granting of autonomy to individual campuses only gradually. With reference to the new university development in Calgary, then in its embryo stage, he reported to a meeting of the National Conference of Canadian Universities in 1960 that *it has been decided that the one Board of Governors will operate both campuses in order to integrate the total program of higher education in the Province. Every effort will be made to provide as far as possible for the needs of the students from Calgary and from the southern part of the Province, though obviously it will not be economic to duplicate in Calgary all the professional Faculties presently in Edmonton. It is agreed that, if possible, certain developments will be fostered in Calgary which do not exist in Edmonton. In fact, one or two Faculties now in Edmonton might be moved to Calgary if this seems advisable. (Johns, 1960b:3)*

Nonetheless, the centralization-decentralization issue between the province's two major cities continued to simmer, as he acknowledged in a 1963 address to his Edmonton colleagues. *The question of complete autonomy has been recently re-opened in a speech given last Saturday at the Color Night Banquet in Calgary. I*

should like to make it clear that complete autonomy and separation should not reach the point of our having two separate Boards of Governors appealing to the Government in a competition for funds. This is a matter which should remain, as far as possible, in the hands of a University Committee, which would make its recommendations to one Board of Governors. (Johns, 1963d:4)

To this theme — the provincial structure of higher education —and, inevitably, to government's role in it, he returned in 1964. *For my own part, I should like to suggest, however, that there should certainly be one body responsible for surveying the needs of higher education on a province-wide basis, assigning responsibilities to the various components, and recommending the fiscal grants necessary to meet these responsibilities. Without such a body the separate institutions could easily fall into unnecessary and costly duplication of effort which would cost the taxpayers dear and produce no adequate compensating benefits. (Johns, 1964a:8)*

In fact, the problem was resolved by the wholesale revision of *The University Act* by the Legislature. In 1966, *The Universities Act* granted autonomy to the Calgary campus under the name "The University of Calgary". Further, it anticipated the creation of a third autonomous institution, The University of Lethbridge, in 1967, followed in 1970 by the inauguration of Athabasca University.

The decade of the sixties, as has been noted, saw the rapid development of a network of community colleges and to this the President gave active support.

The growth of public Junior Colleges is likely to become a significant feature of higher education in this Province and should be fostered and assisted by the University and the Provincial Government, providing they have strong local support. Private Junior Colleges should also have the right to affiliate with the University if they are able and willing to meet the University's standards for such affiliation. (Johns, 1963g:6)

Among the reasons lying behind his support was the expectation that the University, as alternative routes in post-secondary education were developed, might be able to "place less stress on freshman work and more on teaching of senior classes and professional and graduate education." (Johns, 1964b:9)

Despite his own strong support, however, the President was keenly aware that there existed among his colleagues of the University community towards these new institutions an attitude "which, if not actually hostile, was to say the least, highly skeptical."

I can assure you that the idea of junior colleges in Canada has not been one that has had universal appeal across our country. In fact, a great many members of university administrative and teaching staffs have expressed their doubt about the wisdom of establishing a program of public junior colleges or even private junior colleges in affiliation with universities in this country. (Johns, 1963e:11)

Aside from the several levels of government and quasi-government bodies with which, inevitably, it is involved, the modern state university has a relationship to society at large and to its various component groups. There is in the body of the President's addresses considerable evidence of thoughtful examination of the nature of the bonds linking university and community.

It was his concern that the University of Alberta should serve the whole of the province and not merely the two major urban areas, Edmonton and Calgary, in which until 1966 it was based. The institution ought not to be viewed as an acquisition of either city.

. . . We must remember that the University of Alberta is a provincial institution and not the private preserve of either the City of Edmonton or the City of Calgary. We must ensure that whatever is done serves the Province as a whole and the University as a whole in the best way possible.[1] (Johns, 1960e:2)

Rather more sharply, he declared in 1963 that *the object of the Government of Alberta and of the Board of Governors must always be the best interest of higher education in the Province as a whole and* not *the aspirations of academic or civic communities for aggrandizement. To this end a concerted approach must be followed to meeting the needs of students at all levels of post-secondary education and the needs of the Province as a whole. (Johns, 1963g:3)*

This theme — the coordination of available resources in the extension of higher education, the better to serve society — had application beyond the borders of the province. Speaking in Regina to a convocation of the University of Saskatchewan he refers to the desirability of coordination and planning on a *regional* basis through a newly-formed body, the Prairie Provinces' Economic Council.

As University institutions grow in size and complexity, they naturally become much more expensive to operate. If we are to serve

---

[1]The 1966 *Universities Act* provided that each of the subsequently established universities should be termed "Provincial" Universities though the precise meaning of that qualification has never been entirely clear.

our nation, and particularly our western region, most effectively, we must acknowledge the need for greater interdependence and mutual support. The Prairie Provinces' Economic Council has provided a vehicle for this purpose and I should like to assure my Saskatchewan colleagues that it will continue to be my serious intention to foster this policy. But let there be no illusions about the difficulties to be encountered for we are all dedicated to the strengthening of our own institutions and their capacity to be of value to their constituencies. This is as it should be, but we must look beyond our provincial borders and keep in close touch with developments on other campuses. In addition, we must find ways of strengthening areas of excellence wherever they exist; we must share our resources in such matters as library collections; and we should not spend our limited funds in vain competition, with resulting unnecessary and uneconomic duplication. (John, 1968c:1-2)

The acceptance of responsibility to the community at large was a major, continuing component of the President's public addresses. Linked to it on one occasion is an assessment, not untouched with the sardonic, of the sensitivity of the University at large to public sentiment.

The University is an exciting place in which to live and work. It is jealous of its autonomy and tends to resent any interference in its affairs from the public, whether as represented by the ordinary taxpayer or by governments and legislatures. It is not, however, insensitive to the views of the public and most Universities have in their communities large numbers of dedicated staff and administrative officers who are able to assess the common good with some objectivity and seek to serve it through the agency of the University itself. Some of them even have a feeling of responsibility for the practice of good economy in their Department, whether in the use of staff or space, equipment or supplies. (Johns, 1969a:9)

Indeed, to the President the price of institutional freedom is institutional awareness of and response to societal needs.

If universities themselves pay due attention to the needs of society, they may claim the right to perform their functions of higher education without interference from the general public or from the state, however well intentioned such interference might be. Freedom has its obligations and they must be fully met. (Johns, 1960d:3)

Although the principle is clearly enunciated, the mechanics for assessing, interpreting, and subsequently acting upon community needs are left unspecified. In an address early in his term of office, he

appears to invite a measure of community participation in the affairs of the University.

We in the university can offer suggestions to our constituents throughout the Province, throughout Canada and the world, but we need also in turn to learn from you what your needs and aspirations are so that we can discuss together how best to meet them. (Johns, 1961b:7)

Clearly, a specific concern of the President during his tenure of office was what constituted the most appropriate and the most relevant contribution of the university to Canadian society of that day. His conception of relevance goes well beyond the immediate learning opportunities provided in the curricula of the institution. The university, the President stated repeatedly, had an inescapable role to play in solving the problems of society.

Changes . . . have come upon us so suddenly that we [members of society] are in many cases still unable properly to assess the advantages which this revolution has made available to us, much less the social and psychological effects they have on the individual and the economic effects on the community as a whole. Surely it is part of the university's role today to try to evaluate the impact of these changes on man and on society. (Johns, 1961b:3)

Again, towards the end of his tenure of office, he proposes that *the greatest need of society today, however, is not for more sophistication in our handling of the physical world and its materials, but for a broader understanding of man in isolation and in society. In short, there must be a conscious effort on our part, as institutions of higher education, to seek a new approach to the social sciences and to direct some of our best minds to the betterment of society itself rather than to the advancement of our knowledge of matter and its properties. We need more emphasis on economics and politics, psychology and sociology, and we need to achieve greater competence in understanding these academic disciplines. (Johns, 1967d:5)*

But some impatience with the approaches of social scientists to this task is evidenced in the same address.

My own suggestion would be that an understanding of man and his potential for humanity *might well be pursued through a study of the best that man has conceived in the realm of thought as revealed in his creative and scientific writing through the ages. In short, I would ask the social scientists to re-discover their heritage*

through a study of the great relevant literatures of the past instead of through rats or even the great simians.

Reflecting an intense public concern of that day, he suggests an immediate, specific, responsibility of Canadian social scientists:

> *I have tried to make it clear that we must first see society's needs, then assign priorities in our efforts to meet these needs, and finally direct our best efforts to what we conclude are our greatest problems. I believe also that there can be no question but that it is the social sciences which should have the top priority in our universities for the next few years at least and that one of our main tasks will be to bring our two chief language and cultural groups into closer harmony of spirit and collaboration. Once this is achieved, we can enhance our efforts to solve the other great social and political problems of our time, our country, and the world.*
> *(Johns, 1967d:8-9)*

Continuing in this vein at an Annual Meeting of the Canadian Chamber of Commerce, he sets still other priorities to university departments of social sciences.

> *Perhaps the biggest challenge of all, and one which will receive more attention in the next decade, is that of the social implications of scientific research. A scientific or technological victory may carry in its train a social defeat, and scientists can no longer ignore such possible consequences to our society or our environment. The next decade will almost certainly see an increased emphasis on this aspect of research on university campuses as well as in government and industrial laboratories.*
>
> *The greatest challenges in the next decade, however, lie in the field of human relations—economic, social, and political. In spite of the development of an elaborate and generally effective political structure—municipal, provincial, and federal—we still find inequities and malfunctioning at all levels, and especially where one level of government impinges on another . . . universities are in a unique position to do much of what needs to be done in the social sciences today. Not only do they have the resources and the time, but they have, or should have, that objectivity which must characterize all search for truth, beyond all selfish considerations of political power or governmental growth or the selfish demands of special groups. The next decade should see them attack many of these problems with an increasing sense of urgency.*
>
> *Some of the questions they may be expected to consider in the next decade may be noted now.*

Do we suffer from an excess of government? Emerson, in his essay on Politics, said, "The less government we have, the better—the fewer laws and less confided power." Was he right a hundred years ago and would he be right today?

What should the responsibilities of the various levels of government be, and what tax fields should they control?

Should inflation be permitted to continue and monetary values decrease as has been the case for centuries, or should it be controlled? We must remember that control of inflation means control of human beings and their aspirations for a larger share of the common wealth and involves restraint on the unions that press these claims.

Is it possible to control the machinations of the greedy men who seek to amass wealth and financial power by the manipulation of industrial and commercial units into conglomerate structures with no rational justification?

Is the city doomed as a viable political and economic unit in its present form as Mayor Lindsay has said of New York?

Must we continue to limit the birth rate of the most able and productive citizens throughout the world, while that of the least productive continues unrestrained? How do we reconcile social common sense with the sanctions of religion and the freedom of the individual? Should we have a guaranteed annual income for all and, if so, what does this do for human initiative? (Johns, 1970:7-9)

Earlier, there was illustrated the President's belief in the responsibility of government for university support. That responsibility, he makes clear, extended as well to the private sector.

Private individuals have a less obvious responsibility to universities, but one that is no less genuine. If they are blessed with wealth, they owe a debt to society in many forms, of which universities are among the most important . . . they do have a moral responsibility to contribute to the universities to which they owe so much. (Johns, 1960d:2)

Industry in particular, the President asserts, should, in addition to providing fund support, assist the University in the provision of staff, the recruitment of which was a pressing problem of the early years of the decade.

There is one other way in which the staff problem can be met—the use of the human resources in government, business and industry. University staff members have been loaned to government agencies, provincial, national, and international, for years and the

process is still going on. Others contribute their talents as consultants to all facets of our economy. The time has come for some degree of reciprocity in this regard and universities must look to the men in government and industry for help in the classroom and the laboratory. This is a common feature of university life in Latin America, where it is carried to an extreme, and there is a place for it in the English-speaking world. (Johns, 1963c:7)

Many of the addresses of the President during this decade, it will have been noted, were directed to associations of professionals. To these organizations, the President acknowledged the University's continuing responsibility in the provision of professional cadres of sufficient size and adequate training.

. . . There has been an increasing need for highly educated and competent people to fill vacancies in higher education, government, commerce, and industry. To give a few examples, we are short of mathematicians in our universities, our secondary schools, our technical institutes, and our research centres, and in almost every field in which statistics, econometrics, and applied mathematics can be used. Highly skilled economists are almost as much in demand as mathematicians. We need more social workers, librarians, nurses, physiotherapists, dental hygienists, doctors, dentists, and administrators in all these fields, to meet the growing demands for health and welfare services across the nation. (Johns, 1963e:3)

Of particular interest is his recognition of the potential for influence of the professional organizations on the goals of the University.

If there was any organization that influenced the University to an important degree, it would be the Alberta Teachers' Association, which encouraged the further education of . . . teachers in training with a view, ultimately, to having the Bachelor of Education degree or its equivalent the minimum level of education for a qualified teacher in the Province of Alberta. (Johns, 1972)

But in the main, he held *. . . leadership and initiative (or, if you wish, in one or two cases, lack of leadership and initiative) came from the University and their professional faculty members rather than from the professional organizations.*(Ibid.)

Finally, among the external relationships of the University are those with the underdeveloped countries. The President's often repeated view is that the University should not deny assistance to students from underdeveloped countries and, particularly, to those from within the Commonwealth.

When we see the contribution which our people in Canada and other more developed countries of the Commonwealth can make in such new countries, we can scarcely refuse to help them to the best of our ability. The cost may be substantial, but the returns in the improvement of human welfare are even greater. If the Commonwealth is to survive, as I think it must, this is the kind of work we must continue to do. If the people of our country know about the need, I feel confident they will meet the challenge. (Johns, 1964c:9)

But, in his judgment, the University could best make its contribution to the Commonwealth and to developing nations outside of it by the loan of its staff members to those countries.

I should like to say . . . that this kind of work is particularly valuable and we feel that in the long run we can serve newly developing countries best by sending teachers to these countries rather than bringing their students here. The chief reason for this is that it would be possible to make better assessment of the needs of these countries on the spot instead of bringing their students here to study programmes which might have little validity in their own countries. (Johns, 1966a:9)

Nonetheless, when the University acted as host to groups of students from the underdeveloped countries, it must expect to make suitable preparation for them out of its resources.

. . . We must make special provision, not only for their classroom instruction, but also for their reception into our university communities and our way of life. This will mean that we must have staff members with special experience and talents for helping these students adjust to their new and strange environment so that they will profit fully from their academic experience. Since most of these countries can ill afford to send large numbers of their students to Canada, we shall have to set aside some portion of our scholarship funds for their use. In addition, we shall have to send our own graduates overseas to teach in these new countries through such agencies as the Canadian University Service Overseas. There is no better way to promote international understanding and good will than this and Canada is in a unique position to do this effectively. (Johns, 1963e:8)

The Goals of the President for the University

What is immediately manifest from a review of the President's speeches during his term of office is the unflagging effort he invested in sustaining a close and friendly liaison with the community. The very number of his formal speeches to various audiences attest to this; but, coupled to these addresses are innumerable, informal discussions with the public on other occasions at which he represented the University of Alberta. All of these meetings provided him with an opportunity to interpret the University to citizens of the province; many would have enabled him to discern the public's mood of satisfaction or concern with respect to their University. On all these occasions, he served, as it were, as a conduit linking his institution to the society from which its support comes.

In his addresses, the President articulates a broad spectrum of goals emphasizing the essential purpose of the university institution to address itself "to problems of the mind and the spirit of humankind." (Mathews, 1976) He identifies what sociologists would term the University's societal goals, those characterizing its relation to the cultural, economic, and political environment of the province. He relates frequently, clearly, and often pungently his conception of the desirable output goals of the institution—teaching, research, and public service among them—and their characteristics. Those goals which relate to the maintenance of his institution—issues concerning its operation and its structure—he sets out vigorously and candidly.

What might be inferred from his public statements to a wide cross-section of its constituents are these major goals held by the President for his University:

In curricula, to maintain an appropriate balance between the sciences and the arts;

to encourage the development of a variety of institutions for higher education and to broaden access to them;

to maintain a unitary approach to the development of university level education in Alberta under a single Board of Governors, at least for the immediate future;

to ensure that the University of Alberta accepted a responsibility in education to the province as a whole and not merely to a region within it;

to cooperate in the attempt to coordinate higher education on an interprovincial basis;

to support education in the developing countries, particularly those within the Commonwealth;

to improve the quality of teaching in the University;

to establish curricula on the basis of faculty decision;

to maintain curricula which are relevant;

to maintain an appropriate balance between teaching and research;

to evaluate the social implications of scientific research;

to undertake the provision of opportunities in continuing education both to the graduates of the University and to others;

to undertake periodic review and evaluation of the work of the institution, and regularly to assess the institution's changing responsibilities;

to centralize the major development of graduate work in Alberta on a single campus — that of the University of Alberta in Edmonton;

to decentralize authority and responsibility within the institutional structure;

to integrate and harmonize the working relationships among the principal parts of the University;

to ensure that the office of the chief executive supported the teaching staff, effectively implemented decisions taken by the University's various deliberative bodies, and properly interpreted the institution, both internally and externally;

to develop the graduate school;

to guard the autonomy of the institution and, at the same time, to recognize the legitimate claims of society on it;

through acknowledging and reiterating the

responsibility of both the public and private sector for the support of the University, to supplement the institution's access to resources.

It is unlikely that this list of goals is complete; nor can it be concluded that any of them was held throughout the whole of the President's term of office. And, finally, it cannot be assumed that each was shared by all members of the institution which, by the end of the decade, had become a diverse and complex multiversity.

Goals intended, of course, are not necessarily goals achieved. The President, for example, sought for his University a much larger measure of fund support from the private sector, from business and industry. Yet at the beginning of his term, only eight per cent of the University's funds came from that source, while the figure ten years later had, in fact, declined to six per cent. Moreover, one would wish to distinguish between statements of goals — that desired state of affairs sought — and the, perhaps, wistful recollections of its leader of a kind of university that once was.

Armed as one is with hindsight, the temptation is compelling to criticize the choice of goals made by the President. Yet, in reason, each must be weighed in terms of the time in which they were selected and the forces then operative. One would wish to remember, for example, that at the beginning of the decade, the University of Alberta was the only university in the province. Today, in contrast, it is a single element in a complex of systems and subsystems of higher education which number over forty institutions.

The goals inferred from these presidential speeches are those which the President held for his institution and are not necessarily the goals held by the institution. To identify those, one would consult, among other sources of data, the various evidences of the commitment of the University as an organization—the decisions taken by its senior administrative body, the Board of Governors, and those of its principal academic body, the General Faculty Council; the legislative act which described the institution and specified its structure; and, perhaps most important, those data which record the ends to which the University actually applied its financial resources.

The President's speeches, taken together, represent no highflown philosophy of higher education proffered from Olympian heights. They are the homely, earnest expressions of a thorough-going academic of what his University should be, to what it should

aspire. They sketch in broad terms the deeply-felt views of a teacher turned administrator, attuned to the operational realities of his institution and to the conservative boundaries imposed on University change by groups on and off the campus.

The President reckoned, one concludes, that a principal duty was that of maintaining a continuing contact with the society which supported his institution. That liaison, he reasoned, had the potential for a mutually profitable two-way flow of fact and feeling between town and gown. And in all of this task, partly perhaps as a reflection of his own enthusiasm and good humour, the President seemed successful in creating in the public eye an image of the University, not as a cold, aloof, intellectual island, but as a warm, responsive, people's institution, interested in citizen concerns and determined to seek out the public mind.

Today, the milieu in which the North American institution functions has changed radically. Students, newly aware that a degree is no longer a guaranteed passage to a fulfilling career, demand an education more flexible in its content and in its structure. Nor are they as willing to accept as immutable the authority of their teachers and university officers. In the day-to-day process of their education and in the administration of the university itself, their expectation is of greater participation. Government, for its part, sensitive to the clamour for increased support for other of its responsibilities, is acutely conscious of the rapidly escalating costs of higher education. Having earlier given leadership and encouragment to the development of a broad range of post-secondary institutions, it now sees as urgent the need to coordinate the offerings of post-secondary institutions. Latterly, it seems impatient of the conservatism of the university in its response to voter-prompted change and is, with a section of the public, dismayed by what it perceives as a defensive posture by the university. The public, whose interest in higher education a mere two decades ago was scant, now takes an active interest in these institutions, claiming as a matter of right an expanded program of service from the university and broader access for adult students to instruction. Indeed, as one observer of the university scene pessimistically relates, "The modern university is in turmoil and the changes that are overwhelming it are outrunning our ability to understand them." (Baldridge, 1971:1)

Clearly, the president plays the pivotal role in the accommodation to change. In the transformation of the University

of Alberta in the 1960s, that role changed substantially, as it did in North American institutions generally. University presidents then lost much of their former, direct authority and found themselves translated into seekers after consensus. But times and circumstances change. As the wheel of change revolves, the president may well regain some of his former authority. (Cohen and March, 1974:xix)

But whether he is pictured in terms of a conventional exercise of power or, alternatively, in terms of a wielding of personal influence, his principal raison d'être will continue to be the clarification of institutional goals. *An essential phase of this goal-oriented function is to clarify the institution's present goals, and especially to distinguish between the real and the supposed, in order to evaluate the effectiveness of progress toward these goals—and, equally important, continually to re-evaluate the goals themselves. As needs and contexts change, so may goals. . . .*

. . . But it is certainly one of the functions of leadership, be it by administrator, faculty, trustee, or whomever, continually to clarify these goals and periodically to re-examine them in the light of changing desirabilities and feasibilities. (Gross and Grambsch, 1968:v, vii)

It is such clarification which is the essence of presidential leadership. Moreover, it is out of the crystallization of its goals, publicly articulated or privately held, that the institution's organization and administration will flow.

Organization design and structure must follow from and be subservient to strategy—human purposes formulated into organizational goals. It is by these revitalizing acts of leadership that organizations remain useful tools, not stultifying masters. Leadership, then, is a crucial issue, because it provides one safeguard against the risks of multi-organization. (Lawrence and Lorsch, 1969:243)

In that task, given the expanded participation of students and staff, the concern of the public and the obvious interest of government in university affairs, a most important activity of the president will be that of continuing liaison with the institution's many publics. Each of them is very much more aware of their university institutions, more interested in their performance, more alert to their potential in social development, more keenly concerned with their use of resources. Each will expect, indeed demand, an ever-more liberal flow of communication between their

institutions and themselves. It is out of that exchange that the goals of the contemporary university are forged.

The alternatives to the neglect of good relations, through consultation, between the university and the community are, at best, public apathy and indifference toward university problems and, at worst, misunderstanding, mistrust, and even destructive confrontation. Particularly, one speculates, is this likely in a period of rapid social change such as is evident today. As its principal spokesmen, the interpretation by the president of his institution to the community will thus remain a critically important task — the cultivation of a productive relationship between higher education and its public.

The task so energetically taken up by the President was much more than that of smoothing over public mis-understandings and non-understandings of the 1960s. During that period, the goals of the University, its vision of its future, were shaped. For the plainly observable fact in such an institution as the university, which reaches back over a millennium, is that what is past is inevitably an ingredient of the future. With T.S. Eliot, one concludes that

Time present and time past
Are both perhaps present in time future,
And time future contained in time past.

References Cited

Alberta. 1906. *The University Act*, S.A. 1906, C. 42. Edmonton: L.W. Wall, Queen's Printer.

1966. *The Universities Act*, S.A. 1966, C. 105. Edmonton: L.W. Wall, Queen's Printer.

Alberta Bureau of Statistics. 1970. *Alberta Industry and Resources.* Edmonton: L.W. Wall, Queen's Printer.

Baldridge, J.V. 1971. *Power and Conflict in the University.* New York: John Wiley.

Canada. 1951. *Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters, and Science, 1950.* Ottawa: Queen's Printer.

Canada Senate Special Committee on Science Policy. 1971. *A Science Policy for Canada, Vol. I: A Critical Review— Past and Present, 1970; Vol. II: Targets and Strategies for the Seventies.* Ottawa: Queen's Printer.

Caplow, T. 1964. *Principles of Organization.* New York: Harcourt, Brace, & World, Inc.

Cohen, M.D., and March, J.G. 1974. *Leadership and Ambiguity.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Commission on Educational Planning. 1972. *A Choice of Futures.* Walter H. Worth, Commissioner. Edmonton: L.S. Wall, Queen's Printer.

Commission Sponsored by the Canadian Association of University Teachers and the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada. 1966. *University Government in Canada.* Sir James Duff and Robert O. Berdahl, Commissioners. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Cooper, W.M. 1966. "Change in Britain." *Governments and the University.* W.M. Cooper, *et al.* Toronto: Macmillan Co.

Corson, J.J. 1960. *Governance of Colleges and Universities.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Dill, W.R. 1964. "Decision Making." *Behavioral Science and Educational Administration.* D.E. Griffiths, ed. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Gouldner, A.W. 1957-58. "Cosmopolitans and Locals: Toward an Analysis of Latent Social Roles." *Adminstrative Science Quarterly,* Vol. 2.

Gross, E., and Grambsch, P.V. 1968. *University Goals and Academic Power.* Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.

Gunning, H.E. 1974. Quoted in "President-Elect Charts Course." *Folio,* The University of Alberta, Vol. 10, No. 40 (April 11).

Haskins, C.P. 1960. "Society and Scientific Research." *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists,* Vol. XVI, No. 5.

Hughes, Emmet John. 1976. "President Hoover of the F.B.I." *Saturday Review.* May 29.

Johns, W.H. 1959a. "Inaugural Address." Edmonton, April 4.

1959b. "President's Talk to Association of Academic Staff of the University of Alberta." Edmonton, April 7.

1960a. "Greetings from the National Conference of Canadian Universities at the Installation of Dr. John W.T. Spinks." Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, January 30.

1960b. "The Creation of New Universities." Address to Meeting of the National Conference of Canadian Universities, Kingston, Ontario, June 2.

1960c. "Higher Education in Canada Today." Address to the Annual Meeting of the Canadian Psychiatric Association, Banff, Alberta, June 17.

1960d. "Universities as Public Institutions." Introduction to Panel Discussion—12th Annual Conference of the Institute of Public Administration of Canada, Banff, September 16.

1960e. "Location of the Faculties of Commerce and of Law, University of Alberta." Address to Council of the Edmonton Chamber of Commerce, Edmonton, Alberta, December 7.

1961a. "A New Look at Higher Education." Address to University Women's Club of Edmonton, Alberta, March 20.

1961b. "The Role of the University in the Changing Community." Address to a Conference for Community Leaders, Banff School of Fine Arts, Banff, Alberta, April 27.

1961c. "Address to University of Alberta Medical Alumni." Edmonton, Alberta, September 25.
1962. "The University's Role in Teacher Education." Address to the Canadian Education Association Convention, Edmonton, Alberta, September 19.
1963a. "Graduate Education in Canada." Draft Statement prepared for Survey Committee on Higher Education, Edmonton, Alberta, January 31.
1963b. "University Administration." Address to Institute of Public Administration of Canada Regional Group, Edmonton, Alberta, February 27.
1963c. "A National Program for Higher Education in Canada." Address to North Central British Columbia Regional Conference on Higher Education, Prince George, British Columbia, March 23.
1963d. "President's Talk to Association of Academic Staff of the University of Alberta." Edmonton, Alberta, April 2.
1963e. "Higher Education in Canada." Address to official opening of Lethbridge Junior College Building, Lethbridge, Alberta, May 7.
1963f. "An Iconoclastic Program." Postprandial Address to the 27th Congress of the National Federation of Canadian University Students, September 30.
1963g. "The University of Alberta—Unity or Diversity?" Edmonton, Alberta, November 12.
1963h. "A Forecast on University Education in Canada." Address to Seminar sponsored by Inland Cement Company Limited, Edmonton, Alberta, November 18.
1964a. "The Problems of an Expanding University." Address to the Annual Banquet of the Friends of the University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta, March 24.
1964b. "The Function and Scope of Junior Colleges in Alberta." Address to Education Society of Edmonton, Edmonton, Alberta, April 13.
1964c. "Higher Education in the Commonwealth." Address to Men's Canadian Club of Edmonton, Edmonton, Alberta, May 19.
1964d. "Address on the Official Opening of Red Deer Junior College." Red Deer, Alberta, November 27.
1965a. "President's Address to the Ottawa Branch of the Alumni Association." Ottawa, Ontario, February 28.

1965b. "University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta." Address to Association of Academic Staff of The University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta, March 30.
1966a. "International Relations Night." Address to Junior Chamber of Commerce, Edmonton, Alberta, March 30.
1966b. "The Ancient Feud." Address to the Council of Professions, Edmonton, Alberta, May 3.
1966c. "University Expansion in Alberta." Address to St. Albert Chamber of Commerce, St. Albert, Alberta, December 13.
1967a. "The Nature and Objectives of the University." Address to First Plenary Session of the Senate of The University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta, February 24.
1967b. "President's Talk to Association of the Academic Staff of The University of Alberta." Edmonton, Alberta, March 27.
1967c. "Student Leadership." Address to Leadership Seminar, Students' Union Building, Edmonton, Alberta, October 22.
1967d. "President's Address." Annual Meeting of the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada, Montreal, Quebec, November 1.
1968a. "The Human Element in Education." Address to Annual Meeting of the Second Edmonton District Alberta Teachers' Association, Edmonton, Alberta, February 29.
1968b. "President's Talk to Association of the Academic Staff of The University of Alberta." Edmonton, Alberta, March 19.
1968c. "Convocation Address at the University of Saskatchewan Regina Campus." Regina, Saskatchewan, May 17.
1968d. "The University in Society." Address to University of Alberta Alumni, Ottawa Branch, Ottawa, Ontario, November 4.
1969a. "The Developing University." Address to the Edmonton and District Dental Society, Edmonton, Alberta, February 4.
1969b. "The Vulnerable University." Remarks at Annual Appreciation Banquet, Varsity Guest Weekend, Edmonton, Alberta, February 12.
1969c. "President's Talk to Association of the Academic

Staff of The University of Alberta," Edmonton, Alberta, April 7.
1970. "The Decade of Change—Its Effect on Education." Address to the Annual Meeting of the Canadian Chamber of Commerce, Vancouver, British Columbia, September 20.
1972. Private interview with author, Edmonton, Alberta.
Kerr, C. 1963. *The Uses of the University*. New York: Harper & Row.
Lawrence, P.R., and Lorsch, J.W. 1969. *Organization and Environment*. Homewood, Ill: Richard D. Irwin, Inc.
Macpherson, C.B. 1968. *AUCC Proceedings of Annual Meeting*. See also Macpherson's article "The University as Multiple Fool" in the *CAUT Bulletin*, Vol. 19, No. 1 (1970).
Mathews, F. David. 1976. "Toward a New Purpose." *Change*, Vol. 8, No. 9.
Moore, W.E. 1962. *The Conduct of a Corporation*. New York: Random House.
Moos, M., and Rourke, F.E. 1959. *The Campus and the State*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press.
Pfnister, A.O. 1970. "The Role of Faculty in University Governance." *Journal of Higher Education*, Vol. XLI, No. 6 (June).
Presthus, R.V. 1962. *The Organizational Society*. New York: Vintage Books.
Sayles, L.R. 1958. *Behavior of Industrial Work Groups*. New York: Wiley.
Selznick, P. 1969. "Leadership in Administration." *Readings on Modern Organization*. Amitai Etzioni, ed. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall.
University of Alberta. 1971. *University of Alberta Calendar, 1971-72*. Edmonton: Printing Department, The University of Alberta.
Werdell, P.R. 1968. "Teaching and Learning: Whose Goals Are Important Around Here." *Whose Goals for American Higher Education?* C.G. Dobbins and C.B.T. Lee, eds. Washington: American Council on Education.
Wriston, H.M. 1937. *The Nature of the Liberal Arts College*. Appleton, Wis.: Lawrence College Press.